

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

'RELIGION is the undying fire of human aspiration. Its flare searched the Great Dark before our little lamps of culture were ever invented. The monstrous shapes and ghostly figures that seemed to hover where the wild light fought the dark in those early days of savagery have been driven back by the steady, even light of modern culture. But out beyond the illumination of our craft and knowledge there still streams the glare of this quenchless flame of religious aspiration, searching amid vague shapes and shadows for those further possibilities which all Being has to offer. There is no questing in all human life so valiant, so heroic and adventurous as religion.'

---

The quotation is from an exceedingly fresh and able book on *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth*, by Professor H. N. WIEMAN (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). It would be difficult to give an adequate idea of the richness of its contents, which deal both with the method and the concepts of religion, but some notes may be given on a striking chapter entitled 'Worship as a Means to a Successful Life.' 'Successful,' it need hardly be said, in the highest sense.

---

Life is a question of adaptation to environment. 'Life of any sort, and certainly the best life, is not achieved by human effort alone. Rather it is something produced by environmental conditions when we make right adjustment to them. Take, for example, the simple case of breathing. It is frequently assumed that the organism does the breath-

ing. As a matter of fact, the environmental air plays a far more potent and difficult part in breathing than do the lungs. The lungs simply provide a partial vacuum; the air rushes in of its own accord. . . . Or take the case of walking. It is not the body alone that walks. The earth does the walking, the body merely adapting itself to those conditions which automatically bring about the walking. . . . What is true of breathing and walking is true of loving and thinking and appreciating beauty and all the other works and joys of living. In all cases certain environmental conditions initiate (stimulate) and sustain the process, the organism merely adapting itself in such a way as to permit these conditions to fulfil the process called living. And in the highest form of living, in that abundant living which man at his best attains, the environment does not recede, but rather becomes more intimately and richly involved.'

---

The part we humans have to play in living, whether at the biological level, or at the level of most joyous and triumphant living which the greatest spirits have known, is to establish those habits which are so adjusted to environment as to make it possible for the environmental conditions to produce such a life. Now worship is the way we establish that system of habits which is so adapted to the total environment as to catch the supporting lift and movement of this most helpful phase of our total environment—God. 'I think of a little street car in Los Angeles that carries people to the top of



a steep hill. The hill is so steep that the car cannot use a trolley. It is lifted by a steel cable, which runs endlessly beneath the car and between the rails. But the car does not move till it connects with the cable in proper manner. The car stands still until its passengers are in, then a certain clamping mechanism closes down upon the cable and the car is lifted to the top of the hill. . . . Worship is the way we clamp the cable that lifts the highest.'

---

Worship has three stages. The first is that of exposure. We give ourselves a time exposure to God. We put ourselves into that bodily and mental state in which we can feel most profoundly the stimulus of that order of being which most vitally affects us. Our fathers called this stage of worship praise and adoration. The second stage in worship is diagnosis. 'We must find out wherein our habitual adjustments are inadequate for realizing those possibilities which the environment has in store for human living. What is wrong with our "clamping mechanism"? How can we better lay hold on the lifting cable?' In the hour when we seek the highest, in the hour of worship we can see in ourselves what we cannot see at any other time. 'Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my thoughts, and see if there be any wicked way in me.' We may be sure the wicked way is there, but, for the most part, we cannot discover it except by self-examination in worship. Our fathers called this confession of sin. The third stage of worship is reconstruction. It is that curative treatment which cannot be applied until after diagnosis. It is that reconstruction by which the worshipper establishes those mental attitudes which are better adapted to 'clamping the cable.' It is getting right with God.

---

Prayer is here the effective agent. It is not a matter of words, but of attitude and habit. 'The method by which this reconstruction of habits is accomplished is somewhat as follows. In the stage of diagnosis one discovers his peculiar and most fundamental defect or need in respect of habits. Then he forms as clear and definite a concept as he can of what is required of him, in the form of readjusted attitude, to correct the faulty habit and

enable the environment to accomplish what is desired. Then he states this required readjustment of habits in words as comprehensive, accurate, concise, and forcible as possible. These words in themselves alone do not constitute prayer; the prayer is in that attitude of mind and body which the words serve to engender and establish.' But, it may be said, this is mere auto-suggestion. No, it is more. It is prayer to an objective environmental God, in which auto-suggestion may very well have some part to play, as it has in all our converse with the world around us. Auto-suggestion may serve to arouse and establish the prayer, but prayer 'clamps the cable,' and the vital thing is that there is a cable to clamp.

---

By this method of worship one can develop the various arts of effective living. Worship enables us to reach down more deeply into our inmost nature and reshape the secret impulses of the heart as nothing else can. 'The outermost limits to what worship can accomplish by the threefold method of exposure, diagnosis and reconstruction, we do not pretend to be able to state.' One may mention, in illustration, the cultivation of courage, of brotherly love, of mental concentration and accurate thinking, the mastery of fear in all its forms and of the sense of failure. 'But the master art of them all is the art of worship itself, by which may be developed any specific ability within the limits of physiological possibility. And the limits of physiological possibility have never yet been found.'

---

There are, however, two supreme requirements which must be met, else effective worship is impossible. The first is honesty. A man must be honest with himself and with God, searchingly and pitilessly honest, else he cannot expose himself to the presence of God, he cannot diagnose himself, he cannot worshipfully reconstruct. The second requirement is to be definite, specific, and accurate in diagnosis and in statement of need. This can only be done fully in private. Unless the worshipper gets beyond conventional generalities and pious phrases in his private worship he will never accomplish anything. He must be precise and searching, cutting down to the roots of his nature,



if he would worship effectively. And this requires solitude. 'It takes time to learn how to worship. It takes years to acquire the art. One does not become a successful musician in a day. One does not master the methods of high finance in a year. It requires half a lifetime. And it requires no less to master the much higher art of worship. But it is the most precious of all the arts, for it is the key to them all. And we must remember that all arts acquired through worship, and all such habitual attitudes, are prayers. They are wings outstretched to catch the lifting wings of God. Worship is the way we develop such persistent prayers.'

---

One of the fruits of religion is peace. But there is a certain kind of peace which the average religious man covets and which religion, properly understood, does not guarantee. There is a peace possessed by those who believe they have an external authority to which they can appeal, and who can conscientiously bow before the judgment it pronounces. But true authority in matters of the spirit can never be external. How, then, is authority to be reached or defined? Or the question may be put more radically. Does authority, in the old sense, exist at all?

---

These are not new questions. They have arisen wherever the human spirit was fully awake. They were raised in a very acute form at the Reformation. The authority of the Church was challenged, and the allegiance formerly given unquestioningly to her was transferred by the Reformers to the Bible. But it was inevitable that the authority of the Bible itself should be challenged. The rise of the historical method of interpretation and the application to the Bible of the critical method and the scientific spirit, which have led to so many advances in other realms of truth, have certainly modified, if not shaken, the old conception of the authority of the Bible; and men who feel that they can no longer appeal with the old confidence to individual utterances of the Bible have fled for refuge to Christ as the ultimate court of appeal and the final authority in religion.

In what sense, if in any, may the Bible still be regarded as an authority, and how are we to interpret the authority of Christ? These are the questions to which Professor C. H. DODD, M.A., of Mansfield College, Oxford, addresses himself in his most timely book, *The Authority of the Bible* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net). Professor DODD brings to his task all the qualities necessary for a really fruitful discussion; he has a thorough historical and exegetical knowledge of the Bible; he is a man of philosophical mind and of deeply religious spirit. No one can read his book without feeling that he has been brought into a spacious world, in which, while he must walk with the humble reverence due to the great masters of the spirit, he can move with exhilarating freedom.

---

But one who is seeking in the Bible an external and infallible authority will get little comfort from Professor DODD. For one thing, the Bible is not all upon the same level of religious significance and attainment: there are the mountain-peaks of prophecy, and there is the plain country across which the historical and the legal literature moves. Again, the Bible as a whole, and the prophets in particular, are too deeply implicated in the contemporary situation to offer us, who are afar off, a ready answer to the multitudinous problems which we of the twentieth century have to face. The prophets, while they are men of the eternal order, are no less men of their own time. But, if they are not infallible, they were, and still are, creative of religious experience, and, for the religious life, that is something infinitely more important. They had an intimate experience of the great Reality, and their words have still the power to make us participate in that experience of Reality.

---

But there must be no thought of external infallibility. Professor DODD is frank enough to say that 'it is high time to assert unambiguously that the Bible contains a good deal which if it is taken out of a temporary historical context and given general and permanent validity is simply pernicious.' Of utterances like 'Jehovah will not have compassion on their fatherless and widows,' or 'The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish,' he says that 'they are false and they are



wrong.' There is an instinctive Christian criticism which it is legitimate to exercise even upon the words and deeds of Jesus as reported in the Gospels. Not even the evidence of the earliest Gospel will induce him to believe that Jesus cursed a harmless fig-tree because it failed to satisfy His craving for fruit out of season. In the same Gospel there are words of Jesus which 'either are simply not true in their plain meaning, or are unacceptable to the conscience or reason of Christian people.' When we read, for example, in Mk 13 that 'this generation will not pass away until all these things have happened,' by no legitimate ingenuity of interpretation can it be shown that anything resembling some of these events happened before A.D. 100.

Authority in the absolute sense resides in the truth alone. Nowhere is the truth given in such purely objective form that we can find a self-subsistent external authority. When Jesus was asked to furnish proof of His authority, He retorted by asking whether the Baptism of John was of Divine or human origin. The implication was that a Divine thing carries with it its own authentication, and cannot fail to make its appeal to a true mind and an unsophisticated conscience. Jesus does not absolve men from responsibility for their own judgments.

The book gives an admirable sketch of the spirit that animated Judaism, alike in its strength and in its weakness, and it enumerates, as follows, the unsolved problems which Judaism left: (1) the issue between nationalism and universalism, or the question of the implications of monotheism; (2) the issue between righteousness and grace, or the question of the Divine character; (3) the issue between Divine justice and the human lot, or the problem of suffering; (4) the issue between this-worldliness and other-worldliness, or the question of immortality; and (5) the issue between transcendence and immanence, or the problem of mediation. The Christian solution of all these problems came through the discovery of God in Christ. The section in which this thesis is argued is one of the most valuable and convincing sections of the book; and the con-

clusion of the whole matter is that while God, whose supreme act in history is the Incarnation in Christ, touches us supremely in the literature of the Bible, 'the criterion lies within ourselves, in the response of our own spirit to the Spirit that utters itself in the Scriptures.'

---

'I do not think that the tenderness of Jesus has been exaggerated. I do not think that His sympathy has been over-emphasised. I do not think that there has been too much preaching of the love of God or the love of Christ to sinful men. But there has been created a false picture of Jesus because we have had a false idea of love. We have sentimentalised about Jesus, and He could not bear sentimentality.' In these words the Rev. JOHN E. M'INTYRE, in his book *The Idealism of Jesus* (reviewed in another column), lays his finger on a serious error which has had an immense influence for evil on our religious education and on our religious thinking.

---

This error has been a false conception of the historical Jesus. In hymns and pictures and in teaching He has been represented as meek in a sense entirely alien from the truth as we see it in the Gospels. We are familiar with the conventional portrait of Jesus in wall-pictures, that of an effeminate person, with a pale, almost anæmic, face. That cannot be the real Jesus. Jesus lived in the open air. He must often, perhaps habitually, have slept in the open. He walked the length and breadth of the land. He would speak nearly all day to crowds of thousands. 'He was no pale Galilean. His face was bronzed with the weather.' He was tirelessly strong.

---

One of our well-known children's hymns runs:

I want to be like Jesus,  
So lowly and so meek,  
For no one marked an angry word  
That ever heard Him speak.

Could anything be more unlike the Jesus of the Gospels? 'He looked round about on them with

anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts.' St. Mark specially notes that piercing eye of Jesus as it flashed in lightning stroke on the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. Think, too, of the scathing denunciation of the Pharisaic party, 'O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?' Remember His message to Herod, 'that fox.' And picture the scene when He cast the men out of the Temple courts.

Jesus was meek. But the meekness Jesus showed, and commanded, was a humility *towards God*. In face of injustice or hypocrisy Jesus was never 'meek.' He was flint and fire. The fact is that what we see in the Gospels is One who possessed that hardest thing to define, Personality. The man who has personality dominates any company where he appears. He is never negligible. People are either definitely attracted or repelled by Him. This is the effect Jesus produced. He aroused passion everywhere, the passion of devotion, or the passion of hatred.

What we see in Jesus above all, then, is Power. It is significant that when the disciples were retailing the opinions the people had formed of Jesus they should have mentioned that He was regarded as a second Elijah. Could the 'Gentle Jesus, meek and mild,' of the hymn have been thought of as an Elijah? Elijah was the John Knox of Israel, strong, self-reliant, a thunderous figure. And when the people said to one another, 'Here is Elijah back again,' they could only have said that of a person who had in Him something of Elijah's spirit.

Then, again, if more is needed, note that everywhere and always we get the idea of sheer competence in Jesus. He taught as one having authority. 'What manner of man is this?' the crowd whispered, as great deed on great deed was seen. The leper who came to Him had no doubt of

His capacity: 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' The woman said to herself, 'If I but touch the hem of his garment, I shall be made whole.' The learned Pharisee, Nicodemus, came to Jesus to have his doubts resolved. All sorts of people came to Him with problems and questions and needs, believing that here in this new Personality there were wisdom and power.

Have we been wrong, then, in thinking and speaking of His love and even His tenderness? No. But the love of Jesus is not the love of a Person who 'could not say an angry word.' It is the love of a great, strong, august Person. It is strength stooping to weakness. It is sheer Power putting itself at the service of trouble and perplexity and need. 'When Jesus offered Himself in His daily life and at last supremely on the Cross, He did not offer the sacrifice of a weak, passive, ineffective being. He offered the sacrifice of the most living, virile, eager and beautiful spirit the world has known.' Instead of the world turning 'grey with his breath,' as Swinburne said, the true picture of Jesus will always bring fulness of life and power and happiness just because we can worship and trust His power.

It is of the utmost importance that this true picture should be taught in our schools. As Jesus is generally presented to the youthful mind, He does not attract it. The ordinary child never chooses Jesus, or thinks of Him, as one of the great personalities of history. Children do not *admire* Jesus. That is because the conventional portrait of Him is so 'weak and ineffective.' But not only is that portrait untrue, as Mr. M'INTYRE has shown in this excellent chapter on 'Some Neglected Characteristics of Jesus,' it is the source of much of the feeble religious teaching in our time. When Jesus is presented as the Hero, the Being of Power that He actually was, we shall find Him taking His true place in the love and worship and imitation of a new generation.



# Readers of Theological Thought.

Bishop Gore.

BY THE REV. J. K. MOZLEY, D.D., READING.

It is an interesting if not very profitable pursuit to look back to a past age and compare its outstanding personalities in this or that walk of life with those of the present generation. Was there a race of giants then, which has since vanished from the earth? Or is the *laudator temporis acti* as unreliable in his estimate of persons as in his comparisons at other points? Perhaps it is inevitable that the shadows of the departed should grow greater as they recede from us in time, and that near acquaintance, especially in days when popular journalism can make that acquaintance so very near, should not tend to exalt the stature of the living.

Anyhow, we ask our questions and make our comparisons. We scrutinize artists and poets and lawyers and politicians—and, not least, Churchmen and theologians. Was there, in the Victorian Age, or in the early years of this century, an achieved greatness in Biblical scholarship, in dogmatics, in preaching, in ecclesiastical statemanship, greater than anything which we can produce? Did the Cambridge triumvirate, Lightfoot, Hort, and Westcott, take their mantles with them when they passed? Are our theologians mere *epigoni* when set beside Frederick Denison Maurice and Aubrey Moore and Fairbairn? Are there none to carry on the succession of such preachers as F. W. Robertson, Liddon, and Spurgeon? In the gifts which they brought to the guidance of ecclesiastical policy, did Samuel Wilberforce and Robert Rainy and Hugh Price Hughes stand on an eminence since left lonely, with the one exception of him who has so lately laid down the office of Archbishop of Canterbury?

It is, partly at least, the gap between the ages and the conditions of those ages which makes comparison difficult. Georgians may or may not be inferior to Victorians: very different they must be. Yet here and there a bridge may be found, the bridge of a living personality. Such a bridge, the most significant and the strongest in the country of the theologians, is Bishop Charles Gore.

It is a far cry back to the year 1882. That is the earliest date of any work which, in the catalogue of the British Museum, appears in the course of the eleven or twelve pages devoted to the literary labours of Dr. Gore. Since then he has written and written. There are some seventy books,

pamphlets, sermons, addresses, miscellaneous productions, and contributions to composite volumes which have him as their author, not to mention prefaces and introductions that he has supplied, and editorial work he has undertaken. And there is more to come: that, at least, is our good and substantial hope. For his eye is not dim, nor is his natural force abated, and next year he is due to begin his course of Gifford Lectures.

There are circumstances which make the merely quantitative side of his theological work remarkable and even astonishing. For Dr. Gore's life has not been that of the scholar in his study. He has held academic and theological posts: at Trinity College, Oxford, at Cuddesdon as Vice-Principal, at the Pusey House as Librarian and Principal. But University life and the concerns of a theological College do not provide those wide spaces for research and for writing which might be, and probably are, imagined. May I say, without presumption, *Experto crede*? And from 1894 to 1919 Dr. Gore was a public figure, first as Canon of Westminster, where the deep impression which his sermons made must have meant continued and increasing calls upon his time, then as Bishop successively of Worcester, of Birmingham, and of Oxford. And Birmingham, of which he was the first Bishop, meant all the labour of superintending and nourishing the life of a new diocese. Moreover, in 1892 he had founded the Community of the Resurrection. Its home was first at the Pusey House, then at Radley, where Dr. Gore went as vicar in 1893, though only for a year. It was in 1898 that the Community came to a settled abode at Mirfield. Dr. Gore's connexion with it has never ceased, and every year he goes to the meeting of the Chapter in July. This was a new charge upon time and thought. And we must not forget those social interests and activities which have been inspired by, and have drawn out, his prophetic gift, and have opened the door to a wide influence which he never could have attained simply in virtue of his theological and ecclesiastical writings. He and Scott Holland were Westcott's foremost disciples and followers in the days of the old Christian Social Union. He was one of the strongest supporters of that great journalist Mr. Lathbury, in his heroic attempt, which failed,



but failed so nobly, to combine in the *Pilot* the principles of strong Churchmanship and political and social progress, and to find a constituency of readers large enough to ensure the paper's success. It is this union of the man of thought and the man of action, of the theologian and the administrator, the Bishop and the social reformer, which is so striking. It is not that these pursuits and duties are necessarily incompatible with one another—but few men have the inclination or the energy or the patience to find the possibility of keen attention to different calls and claims.

Here, then, we have a man who has done much. What of the man himself? For no one can achieve so much without a personality, without gifts of mind and character, of more than ordinary weight. This is not a character sketch, and the attempt at the analysis, sometimes at the dissection, of living people is often carried to the furthest limits compatible with any decent respect for their individualities. But this may be said: knowledge gained through much patient study, and scholarship of the type we associate rather with the great Anglican divines of past generations than with the modern German *gelehrte*, are associated with an outlook characterized not by subtlety or imaginative genius but by singular directness and independence. Making no claim to be a polymath, he yet reserves the rights of his own judgment in a manner and degree not too common. On the whole, scholarship, not least theological scholarship, tends to departmentalize itself. A man is an expert in Old Testament, or in Church History, or in Philosophy of Religion; within the limits of his expert knowledge he is thoroughly competent and formidable. But where he knows he is not an authority there he is inclined to be silent altogether, to distrust his judgment because of the short circuit of his knowledge. This has its good side, morally in humility, intellectually in the abstention from foolish speculation. Nevertheless, it is not an unmixed blessing; it may mean at times something like a failure of moral courage; and experts are not always wise.

One never feels of Bishop Gore that he puts his judgment into the keeping of any expert. I do not mean that he never depends too much on the conclusions of others. It is certainly arguable that in the somewhat exclusive emphasis he lays upon the Prophets of Israel in connexion with monotheism he was unduly influenced by the late Dr. H. F. Hamilton's work, *The People of God*. But that is not to say that in this connexion or in any other Bishop Gore has failed to pass the con-

ceptions of others through the sieve of his own thought. Some one has spoken of a long-standing quarrel or contention which Bishop Gore has had with the philosophers. What I take to be the broad truth in this matter is not that he claims to enter the metaphysical field as a challenger in purely philosophical debates. There is nothing in his case parallel to what may be regarded as the unfortunate experiences of Dr. Sanday, when that eminent New Testament scholar involved himself in speculations about the subconscious. But Bishop Gore maintains that the philosophers are wrong in neglecting as much as they do Christian theology, and such leading ideas in that theology as revelation and incarnation. And what he would like to see is a Christian philosophy built up to-day in the light of modern knowledge, on the basis of Christian postulates. The important 'Essay on the Relations of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy' in the volume *Can we then Believe?* gives his mind very fully on this subject. It combines friendliness to philosophy with that spirit of judicial independence which befits the Christian theologian.

It is this independence of mind which is the secret of what some observers find difficult to understand in Dr. Gore—the union of elements broadly describable as conservative and liberal. Having satisfied himself of the truth of the Catholic tradition in respect of creeds, ministry, and sacraments, Dr. Gore has held unwaveringly to positions which seem to him involved in that tradition, and has consistently opposed whatever would be, in his judgment, equivalent to the stultifying of his acceptance of that tradition. He takes the responsibility, which he has urged that we all ought to take, of making up his mind and saying 'Yes,' and, therefore, also 'No.' But with this adherence to the Catholic tradition has been associated an acceptance of the critical method and attitude with respect to the Bible, an interpretation of the limitations involved in our Lord's manhood which is certainly not that adopted in patristic or classical Anglican theology, and a cautious yet definite movement away from the doctrine of eternal punishment. In these respects it has appeared to Dr. Gore necessary to recognize that theology has been too confidently deductive.

What is true of Dr. Gore theologically is also, and naturally, true of him ecclesiastically. It is not that he has the cross-bench mind. He is not in the least like the typical 'moderate,' who is often a little bit of everything with no very central convictions. But Dr. Gore is not that other type,



'the good party man.' That person is always in danger of believing in the party and the cause because it is the party and the cause. And because the advantage of the party constantly seems bound up with an effort to occupy and retain some new and further-on position, the party man tends to be an extremist. From such an attitude Dr. Gore is far removed. He has little of that trustful and often one-eyed optimism which is an almost essential attribute of the good party man. He is, and, I imagine, always has been since he consciously adopted a position, an Anglo-Catholic. But if all Anglo-Catholics were like Dr. Gore, or took him as their leader, there would be a very different story to tell of the recent history of religion in England. It is at least possible that the Prayer Book of 1927—to use that rough-and-ready if inexact title—would be by now as much part of the law of the land as the Prayer Book of 1662. If one wants to be quite accurate, one must allow that neither the older-fashioned title Tractarian nor the new term Anglo-Catholic in its modern connotation quite fits Dr. Gore. I say 'new term,' because as the usual and definitive description of a party it is quite modern. It is only since the War that Anglo-Catholic Congresses have been held. With certain developments, especially in connexion with extra-liturgical eucharistic devotions, Dr. Gore is not in sympathy. And any tendency towards the development of a system that would appear as simply Roman Catholicism without the Pope can look for no support from him.

In point of fact, Dr. Gore is no very enthusiastic admirer of any of the institutional embodiments of Christian truth and the Christian spirit as he sees them at work in the world to-day. A convinced Churchman for whom any essential contrast between institutional religion and the religion of the Spirit is unthinkable, he is the last man to feel satisfied with the institutions. His judgment upon Anglicanism can be extraordinarily severe. It is safe to say that no English Free Churchman would have committed himself to the sentence which I take from Dr. Gore's last published address—his sermon entitled *Dangers and Duties*, preached, be it noted, as one of the opening sermons of the recent Cheltenham Church Congress. It is a sentence which expresses no momentary pessimism, but a conviction long and deeply rooted: 'When I reflect upon the history of the Church of England—upon its long-continued and almost unparalleled worldliness; upon its Erastian betrayal of its own spiritual liberties; upon its long-continued ac-

quiescence in the intolerable wrongs of the poor and helpless; upon its abiding preference of policy to principle,—I cannot but expect divine judgment, which may be as devastating as that which fell upon the ancient Church of Africa, though wholly different in character.' We are, indeed, a long way removed from the spirit of Dean Church's *credo* as to the Church of England—'with all its faults the most glorious Church in Christendom.'

Had Dr. Gore not been a Christian he might have been as radical a pessimist as Thomas Hardy; and many may hold that he sometimes gives the impression of unduly overlooking or underrating the brighter side of things. But if we use the word pessimism as at all descriptive of his outlook we must remember that it is never that of the Manichæan or fatalist, but always that of the prophet and moral reformer. For Dr. Gore is the Christian prophet and moral teacher with, in his own characteristic phrase, 'a permanently troubled conscience.' It is this which, more than anything else, has enabled him to work with Christians and non-Christians from whom, in theology and ecclesiastical attachments, he has been widely separated. There is in him the hard grain of the soul which demands justice: he lays the stress less exclusively on love than do some modern teachers. In all this, and, indeed, in other respects, he reminds me a good deal of the late Dr. Forsyth.

A study of Dr. Gore's theological work would call for far more space than a single article can appropriate. Yet something must be said of his labours in several branches of theological learning.

First, then, we must note his Biblical studies. The Commentaries on Romans, on Ephesians, and on the Epistles of St. John are not framed on the lines of the classic works of Lightfoot; nor are they comparable in massiveness and minuteness with great German commentaries of to-day. But in lucidity, directness, and moral application they have a place of their own. Along with these we shall class the Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, and the contributions which he has made to the new one-volume Commentary on Holy Scripture issued by the S.P.C.K., of which he has been the General Editor. In it he has written on 'The Bible in the Church,' on 'The Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ,' and on 'The Virgin Birth of our Lord,' and has commented on St. Luke's Gospel. In all Dr. Gore's New Testament work there is combined a belief in the general reliability of the writers, a refusal to identify inspiration with inerrancy, and a sceptical attitude towards that 'religious-historical' method which would seek to explain some of the leading



New Testament ideas, with obvious consequences for the narrative, by reference to the syncretistic religious tendencies of the age. The article on the Virgin Birth will be found instructive in this connexion. We may note the difference in his valuation of the accounts given in the Third and the First Gospel respectively. 'All things considered,' he says, 'the present writer would not be disposed to attach a great deal of importance to the story in the First Gospel if it stood alone. Its value lies in the fact that in spite of its complete independence of St. Luke's narrative it agrees with it on the fundamental point of the virginal conception of Jesus, and that the story of His birth and infancy is told, so noticeably, from the side of Joseph.' At the same time, Dr. Gore would refuse to regard the question as one to be decided simply on the Biblical evidence. He does not rank tradition with the Bible, but he would insist on the relevance of tradition as bearing witness to the central current of the Church's thought. So he writes: 'The true idea of the Incarnation and the fact of the Virgin Birth appear in early Church history as indiscernible.'

Of Dr. Gore's conception of Inspiration something more must be said, for here, without any doubt, is the point where his influence on Biblical studies has been most far-reaching. His essay on 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration' in *Lux Mundi* (first edition, 1889) was one of those theological writings which make an end and therefore a beginning. It made an end of the idea that the Anglican High Church movement was committed to the doctrine of Scriptural inerrancy and, in effect, to all the traditional views of authorship, dates, and the like. It broke with that conception of Biblical inspiration and authority which Pusey and Liddon had shared with their Evangelical opponents, which, in essentials, classical Protestantism and the Roman Catholic Church alike affirmed. So it meant the beginning of a new era, not only in the gradual acceptance by the great majority of High Church theologians of the main conclusions emerging from the studies of those who were described as the Higher Critics, but also in a new attitude towards the problems of the meaning of revelation and of authority in religion. It meant a re-orientation of the High Church movement away from the Roman Catholic Church on a matter of great doctrinal importance. What Dr. Gore claimed and claims is that Christianity and Catholicism are not bound up with a belief in Biblical inerrancy. As I understand the Roman Catholic position (and I realize that there are explanations and interpretations of the meaning of inspiration of which we must take

account, as, for instance, with regard to truth in the 'literal sense'), it is expressed in such a statement as that of Dr. Arendzen and Dr. Downey in their article 'Inspiration,' contained in the volume *The Religion of the Scriptures*, namely, that 'inspiration necessarily involves the absolute veracity of every statement of the Bible; for as God wrote it, and God cannot lie, the Bible cannot contain error of any kind.' Now, in Dr. Gore's *Lux Mundi* essay there was not an actual dogmatic denial of inerrancy, but there was a very definite acceptance of the view that the facts as recorded in the historical portions of the Old Testament were not always the facts as they originally happened—that there had taken place an 'unconscious idealizing of history.' Dr. Gore wrote tentatively and cautiously, but the storm which broke made it clear that the significance of what he had said was understood. There could be no clean cut between the Old Testament and the New. Dr. Gore had not made one, but, as a matter of fact, he had directed his attention in this part of the essay mainly to the Old Testament. In his much later work (1924), *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, the idea of the inerrancy of the records in any part of the Bible is quite definitely denied: 'There are mistakes in the Gospels and a great number of more or less important discrepancies of detail.' Thus, for him, inspiration is not only a different thing from infallibility, but does not involve infallibility. The Biblical writers were inspired by the Spirit of God; but they were not inerrant.

Next we must take note of his work in Dogmatic Theology. Here his most important contributions are the Bampton Lectures for 1891 on *The Incarnation of the Son of God*; the *Dissertations* of 1895, in which a fuller treatment was given to three subjects connected with the Incarnation; the study of eucharistic doctrine published under the title, *The Body of Christ*, in 1901, a time of acute sacramental controversy in the Church of England; and the famous trilogy, *Belief in God*, *Belief in Christ*, and *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, which belongs to the years 1921-1924. The title of the Bampton gives the key to Dr. Gore's central interest. He is, pre-eminently, the theologian of the Incarnation. In line with this is his doctrine of the Church and of the Sacraments. It is not that he passes over lightly the theology of the Atonement, of the Resurrection, and of the Holy Spirit. But every great religious teacher is inclined to draw his thoughts from and to one centre; and with Dr. Gore that centre is the amazing and adorable act of the Everlasting Son in taking to



Himself human nature. And as to his theology of the Incarnation, the ellipse of his thought revolves round two foci—that personal pre-existence of the divine Son, so clear in the teaching of St. Paul and St. John, which controlled the dogmatic thinking of the great names of the ancient Church, and is the permanent barrier against any substitution of an immanent for an incarnational Christology; and that reality of Christ's manhood which implies for Dr. Gore such a kenotic doctrine as may be expressed in these words from *Belief in Christ*: 'He emptied Himself of divine prerogatives so far as was involved in really becoming man, and growing, feeling, thinking, and suffering as man.'

Let me briefly summarize certain further emphases which arise in connexion with Dr. Gore's Christological teaching. First, for the positive picture of Christ we must always return to the Gospels. Secondly, the decisions of the great Councils on Christology are permanently true and their terminology adequate as expressing and defending the idea of a real incarnation. The long note in *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, in examination of Dr. Mackintosh's criticism of Chalcedon, is very important in this connexion. But, thirdly, the conciliar decisions must be understood in relation to their primary motive, which was negative—to exclude false theories, destructive of a real incarnation. Finally, we must refuse such corollaries drawn from the conciliar decisions as ascribe to the incarnate Son omniscience within the sphere of His mortal life, or would conceive of a juxtaposition in Him of two consciousnesses—one divine, one human.

The more speculative elements in Christology do not attract Dr. Gore. Of such a conjectural theory as that of Dr. Temple that if, *per impossible*, the divine nature could be abstracted from Jesus Christ there would be left—not nothing, but a man, Dr. Gore remarked to the present writer that he became increasingly suspicious of incursions into the unverifiable. This is to be borne in mind in connexion with his eucharistic theology. His doctrine is that of the real presence of Christ in the sacramental species after consecration; the bread and wine become His body and blood. But transubstantiation seems to him unsatisfactory as a theory, in the same sort of way as monophysitism is unsatisfactory in Christology, and as an attempt to define beyond the limits of our powers. It is, in large part, the same motive which is at work in his unwillingness to support extra-liturgical devotions focused upon the reserved sacrament. He dis-

trusts the kind of logic which he thinks he sees at work, and is not convinced by the pragmatic argument.

So we come to the third main activity in Dr. Gore's writings. Biblical expositor and dogmatic theologian, he has also been a many-sided and persistent ecclesiastical controversialist. This he has been because of his deep-rooted belief that those who assent to positive doctrines must be prepared to defend them. So he has fought, openly, tenaciously, with complete lack of bitterness, never, within my knowledge, on any single occasion introducing a personal note, on three great fronts. He has fought for episcopacy and an episcopally-ordained ministry as essential in Church order, with the doctrine of apostolical succession as the theological truth of the matter. His book, *The Church and the Ministry*, is a long defence of this position; his first publication, in 1882, was a critical review of Hatch's Bampton Lectures; his statement at the Cambridge Church Congress of 1910 that 'the Anglican communion would certainly be rent in twain on the day on which any non-episcopally ordained minister was formally allowed within our communion to celebrate the Eucharist' was as inevitable a corollary of his fundamental convictions as it was unquestionably true to the facts of the Anglican situation. He has fought for the standing of the Church of England as a true branch of the Catholic Church against Roman Catholic attacks. If this involved criticism of various Roman Catholic positions, of aspects of Roman Catholic doctrine and cultus, one must allow that any other proceeding would have been quite unreal. Indeed, I would suggest that it was very desirable that one who possessed this background as an Anglican controversialist should have been one of the Anglican participants in the Malines conversations. And, finally, he has entered again and again into controversy with the Modernists on the subject of the Creeds, and of the legitimacy of 'symbolic' assent to the clauses asserting our Lord's birth from a virgin, and His resurrection. Where the Creeds assert the occurrence of historical facts in this world of time and space, there the confession of faith must mean the acceptance of those facts as historical according to the Creeds' meaning. In particular, such acceptance must be required of the ministers of the Church. That is Dr. Gore's position on a subject which may give rise to even more significant discussion in the future than in the past.

It is with an acute sense of how much has been left unsaid that I bring this appreciation of Dr.



Gore to an end. In particular, practically no account has been given of the substance of his moral and social teaching, of which the latest expression appears in his Halley Stewart Lectures, *Christ and Society*. What has been said may, perhaps, contribute something to the understanding of the profound influence which Dr. Gore has exercised and still exercises as theologian, teacher, and—man, within the Church of England and beyond its borders. He is not one of the very

greatest of scholars or of theologians. But theology has been alive in his teaching, and more than any other man of his generation he has made it live for others. On the history of thought within the Church of England during the last forty years no one has set so strong a mark. And of what he has meant in the life of his time there can be no more adequate symbol than that statue of him—the only statue, I imagine, of a living Bishop—which stands before the pro-cathedral in the great city of Birmingham.

## Literature.

### THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY.

WE hear laments that few great books are being written in our time. Professor C. J. Cadoux has already produced some valuable studies, and now he has given us a really big work. It is entitled *Catholicism and Christianity* (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net). The sub-title reveals its aim; it is 'A Vindication of Progressive Protestantism.' This is a learned work, but it is always readable. It is a long argument which, with copious footnotes that attest an extraordinary amount of reading, occupies seven hundred pages; but the reader does not grow weary. It reveals Dr. Cadoux as a sound historian, a most erudite scholar, and a great constructive thinker. He sees both sides but never becomes uncertain. He acknowledges all that is admirable in Catholicism, and all that has been weak in traditional Protestantism; yet he is confident, and makes us confident with him, that the last word is with Protestantism, delivered from its old fetters of scholasticism.

His sober, penetrating criticism of the Catholic view of the seat of authority is, point by point and in its cumulative effect, so devastating that we shall await with the keenest possible interest answers from the Catholic side. Roman views have not been subjected to so annihilating a barrage from the three sides of philosophy, history, and morals since Hase's day. Hase wrote in 1862; Dr. Cadoux, living in a largely new world of thought, gives the old controversy a setting which was not possible for Hase.

The problem of authority in religion is highly complicated. Biblical criticism has cast serious doubt on the old-fashioned simple appeal to Scripture, which indeed was never quite so simple as it

sounded. The Quakers, vastly more influential than their numbers might suggest, compelled men to think of the ultimate authority of 'the inner light.' No one possessed of knowledge can deny in some sense the authority of the Church. How are the three related? We merely say that Dr. Cadoux is the wisest and most knowledgeable guide towards a solution that we have met. We are not indeed certain that we would express everything precisely as he puts it; what we are perfectly sure of is this, we have here a book, a much-needed book, which no one who would have a clear mind on the subject of authority, or on the real nature of Catholic and Protestant claims, can afford to neglect.

The foreword by Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet should be carefully read. It is not only a most helpful exposition of the views of Dr. Cadoux; it is a valuable independent contribution to the subject.

### SOULS IN THE MAKING.

Here is a book that should set many ministers thinking and wondering and studying, and perhaps something more. Professor Mackenzie of Nottingham is a devout and earnest soul, very eager to help his fellow-men and women, and very sure that there is in Jesus Christ all that any one of them can need. But for a time he found himself baffled in many instances in all his efforts to get the power of Jesus Christ across to them. He took to a close study of psychology, psycho-analysis, psychotherapy, and the like, and has, as he believes, found the solution of his problem there. Many others think so too. For it seems that a steady stream of all kinds of difficult cases keeps pouring to him; and he is absolutely certain that in case



after case, many of which he cites with details, he has disentangled the knot in life and character, and has enabled the power of Christ really to operate. So much so, that he calls his book *Souls in the Making: An Introduction to Pastoral Psychology* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), which he thinks ought to be a recognized department in the training of the ministry, giving the needed skill to walk with a sure step through the darker corners of those curious human minds with which ministers are supposed to deal. It is an interesting study. No doubt all these books are written in a maddening jargon which gives an illusion of profundity that is largely deceptive. 'The extrovert is always orientated by the object; the introvert by his thoughts or feelings' sounds as if one were saying something. But, translate it into English, and you are left facing a platitude so trite that no human being would bother to utter it. Moreover, Professor Mackenzie is so very sure, that at times he raises a perhaps unreasoning opposition in the mind. Such is the wickedness of human nature in those of us who have not learned to sublimate our naughtinesses. Perhaps our nurses were too dogmatic! Anyway, there it is. And quite certainly, if bungling creatures take to applying the Professor's methods without long and careful study, there is going to be widespread trouble, and a great many very puzzled young ministers gazing in horrified bewilderment at a blaze of scorching indignation which they have lit where they meant only to help. Yet Professor Mackenzie has a vital subject, and he possesses the needed knowledge and experience to speak of it with authority; in the right hands, and rightly used, his book should be of potent value.

#### THE PENTATEUCH.

Speaking of his book on *The Pentateuch: A Historical Record* (Marshall Brothers; 31s. 6d. net), the Rev. William Turnbull Pilter, M.R.A.S., remarks that 'it is essentially a student's book.' This is very true. It is packed from end to end of its six hundred and forty-seven pages with such an abundance of material, largely philological and archæological and connected more particularly with Assyria and Egypt, that only a critic of vast erudition could meet the writer on equal terms. The spirit of the book, however, while constructive, is also in part polemical, for it is indirectly an attack on the Higher Criticism, on its view of the early history and on its documentary analysis. It is written to defend the historical accuracy of the

Biblical records, and as Gn 14 has been the subject of special attack, so Mr. Pilter makes it the object of special defence. Moses, of course, is the writer of the Pentateuch. One cannot but feel that, with every desire to be fair, the writer is occasionally less than fair to the views he is opposing. He speaks, for example, of the 'hastiness with which the sources hypotheses of modern Biblical criticism have been promulgated.' One might modestly believe that a hypothesis which has stood the test of one hundred and seventy-five years cannot be justly accused of having been promulgated in haste. Of Driver's treatment of Gn 14 he remarks that 'he makes attempts to be fair, but is under the domination of the Higher Criticism'—for which, however, Driver in his Introduction has given adequate and excellent reasons. He speaks rather scoffingly in one place of 'arm-chair critics'; among these would he include Sellin, who, though he accepts the documentary analysis, is a highly experienced and very distinguished archæologist? Elsewhere he speaks of a 'Scotch Professor who some years ago treated the prophecies of Isaiah, in his Commentary on that Book, in the same hypothetical but decidedly egotistical manner.' If this 'absurd and hypothetical rearrangement' should be an allusion to Sir George Adam Smith's great expository commentary, his grateful readers will wonder whether the man who derides this 'rearrangement' is as competent in the field of literary criticism as in that of archæology. Nor are the opponents of criticism agreed among themselves. Mr. Pilter, for example, places Sodom about the north end of the Dead Sea; Mr. M. G. Kyle, on the other hand, to whom the modern critics are also anathema, places it at the south end.

From Mr. Pilter's book, behind which obviously lie many years of patient toil, we may learn a vast deal about the ancient world—about Babylonia and Western Asia, about Egypt, about Manna—but nothing that need seriously shake our faith in the broad lines of the documentary analysis.

#### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Canon Charles E. Raven, D.D., has conferred a signal benefit on the religious public by his new book, *Christ and Modern Education* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). The book owes its existence to the meeting of the International Missionary Council at Jerusalem. Dr. Raven's ideas in outline were submitted to a group of experienced educationists, and he was encouraged to fill in the outline and submit the result to a



wider audience. The larger part of the book before us is devoted to a study of the contents and method of the teaching given by Jesus. Its main aim is said to be to prove that these fulfil the requirements laid down by the wisest educationists and psychologists of to-day, and supply clear and practical guidance as to the scope and purpose, the method and the technique, of religious education.

The contents of the book are, however, wider than this declared purpose. They may be divided into three parts, which are not kept separate. Dr. Raven examines the method and results of religious education as it is practised to-day among us. He lays down certain principles and methods for its improvement. And he seeks to show that the guidance we need is to be found in the Gospels. In the first two of these tasks he is eminently successful, and this is the real value of his book. He has no difficulty in showing that the religious education given in our schools is deplorably bad. It substitutes instruction for education, thereby stressing not the development of personality but the communicating of 'facts.' And this instruction itself is often badly given, in ignorance of critical results and of the golden truth of the progressiveness of revelation. All this is largely true, and its careful statement here would do a great deal of good if the transgressors could be got to read Dr. Raven's book.

We are in entire agreement also with the author in his insistence on the meaning and purpose of education itself, on the fundamental place of religion in it, and on the general exposition of the principles Jesus taught. There are admirable chapters also on the necessity of educating parents, and even ministers! And the emphasis on worship and service as essential parts of religious training is as much needed. We are, however, a trifle doubtful whether Dr. Raven has not 'pressed' somewhat in his use of the teaching of our Lord as a model for educationists. The general principles Jesus lays down are, of course, our guide in viewing life and duty. He knew what was in man, and therefore His 'psychology' points the way. But beyond that we may not, perhaps, go. The eternal element in the Lord's teaching has to be applied by each age according to its needs and experience.

But that is of less importance than the great matters on which Dr. Raven speaks both with authority and with helpfulness. We wish his book could be read by multitudes of parents and teachers. Let us hope its message will go far and wide, for it is much needed.

### RELIGION WITHOUT GOD.

*Religion without God*, by Mr. Fulton J. Sheen, Ph.D., S.T.D. (Longmans; 15s. net), is a learned and powerful criticism of much of the philosophic and religious thought of our time from the standpoint of Roman Catholicism. The writer is perhaps too sweeping in his condemnation of modern thought. One would scarcely gather from his pages that there were among Protestants any scholars who upheld the Christian doctrine of God. Still it cannot be denied that the currents of thought which he sets himself to oppose are running to-day with almost overwhelming force, and anything that will help to stem the torrent will be welcomed by all Christian minds.

In the first part of his treatise Dr. Sheen presents modern views, with ample quotations from leading authorities. He finds two conclusions emerging: '(1) There is a growing tendency in contemporary philosophy to present a religion without God. This is done either by denying God altogether, which is rare, or else by emptying the God-idea of all traditional content, and identifying it with anything as vague as a "nisi" and as vaporous as "society divinized." (2) As a substitute for religion in terms of God and man, the majority of philosophers of religion offer a religion in terms of value or friendliness of the universe.' In Part II. he traces out the historic origin of the contemporary idea of religion. It has arisen from a threefold denial of the transcendent in connexion with the three great spiritual realities of Grace, Intellect, and Will, resulting in subjectivism, rationalism, and pragmatism. In Part III. these philosophies are examined critically in the light of the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas, of which Dr. Sheen is an acknowledged master.

No summary can give an adequate idea of the weight of learning and the vigour of argumentation displayed in this work. The writer is fully abreast of the latest theories in physics and natural science. He is sympathetic while these are confined to their own proper sphere, but he demurs against their claim to rule the whole realm of thought. 'There is something tragic in our modern philosophy of religion. Much of it is intoxicated by modern physics; space-time has gone to its head; whole cosmic streams of flux have swept it away from its moorings. Space-time has become a cult and Time a God and Physics a Revelation. Philosophers of religion await the latest decree of space-time physics as industrialists await the latest design in machinery.' 'There is humility and there is



prudence in the caution of scientists when they speak of their theories as hypotheses, but there is no humility and no prudence in the recklessness with which philosophers of religion apply these hypotheses to religion. Religion is not to be made the proving ground of every scientific hypothesis any more than the soul is to be made the puppet of every demand of the body.'

### BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

*The Bible True*, by An Unknown Christian (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net), is written 'to re-assure those whose faith in the Bible is being shaken by modern criticism.' We fear that any faith that is in serious danger of being shaken will be little helped by a book of this kind, which displays only the most superficial acquaintance with the methods of criticism, and no knowledge at all of its motives. We are tired of hearing of the 'bishops, professors and doctors of divinity who endeavour to tear the Bible to shreds,' of the 'scholar who sits in his arm-chair cutting the Bible to bits,' of 'the Theological College which pours scorn upon the Old Testament stories,' etc. The valuable constructive and interpretative work done by 'critics' like Driver, Peake, G. A. Smith and a score of others is sufficient refutation of these preposterous allegations.

A book of a very different calibre is *Reasonable Biblical Criticism*, by Professor Willis J. Beecher, D.D., of Auburn (R.T.S.; 7s. 6d. net). It, too, is conservative, but sanely so. While its aim is to 'set forth the orthodox ideas so that they shall appeal to the thinking of the present generation,' the writer, so far from scoffing at the critics, admits that the older views were inadequate and needed the protest which is implicit in the modern view. Not content with vague generalities, Dr. Beecher deals with specific problems, such as those involved in the Genesis narratives, Deuteronomy, Daniel, and Esther; and he has much that is interesting and valuable to say on the Legislation of Hammurabi, as well as on the chronology of the Old Testament, on which he is an expert. He sometimes, doubtless unconsciously, misrepresents the critical position, and some of his statements of the conservative position could be, and have repeatedly been, challenged successfully by the critics; for example, the statement that 'each prophetic book presupposes the Hexateuch, the D and the P parts as well as the J and the E parts.' Naturally Dr. Beecher is also averse to the treatment which the miraculous narratives frequently receive from

the modern school. Some of the arguments by which he defends conservative positions will hardly appeal to a mind which approaches the Biblical narrative without bias; but the discussion, which is always conducted in good temper, rests on argument and not on bare assertion. But surely Dr. Beecher is not right when he says that 'the Modern View attempts to discredit the older tradition without having anything adequate to offer as a substitute for it,' or that 'those to whom the prevailing type of criticism has made the Bible spiritually a richer book cannot be relatively very numerous.' Rather would we say that the critical method has brought illumination, and that not a few are walking gladly in the light.

### THE TEXT OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Principal Oman has published an emended form of his theory of the sections of the Apocalypse which he had made known in 1923—*The Text of Revelation: A Revised Theory* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net). In essentials the theory is not changed, it is confirmed. He is more convinced than before that the Apocalypse consists of a number of sections almost exactly equal in length. Formerly he secured equality of length by removing what he considered glosses. Criticism at once fastened on the arbitrariness of that, and he himself felt that the criticism was not unfounded. Suddenly it occurred to him that 'the correct test of all glosses might be that they are repetitions'; for example, 'he that hath ears to hear,' etc. By removing all doublets—'repetitions by the original editor from his author,' the almost exactly equal length of the sections is demonstrable, if we make the rearrangements in the material which Dr. Oman suggests.

Following this plan we get a book of seven parts of approximately equal length, each containing four sections almost equally long. This kind of work may seem at first sight to be ingenious rather than practically important; but as we read through the Apocalypse, as he sets out its contents for us, we are greatly impressed with the value of his history as illuminative and helpful.

### THE CAMBRIDGE SHORTER BIBLE.

Some time ago the Cambridge University Press delighted teachers and parents by the issue of their 'Children's Bible' and 'Little Children's Bible.' These two charmingly printed books sprang from a syllabus issued by the Cambridge-shire Education Committee, but, apart from that,



they were arranged with an intelligent appreciation of the way in which the Bible should be presented to children. And they must have done an immense amount of good. They were, however, frankly selections, and many who used them have felt that there was not enough of the Bible included in them. The editors themselves, Dr. A. Nairne, Dr. T. R. Glover, and Sir A. Quiller-Couch, must have realized this, for they have now produced a sequel to their former books in *The Cambridge Shorter Bible* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). This publication is an event. It gives us all but the least attractive and least useful parts of the Bible. Little of the legislation is included. Narratives that overlap are left out; for example, there is nothing of Chronicles. But all that is really essential is here. The Gospels and Acts are unabridged. Only the parts of the Prophets that are unintelligible to English readers without technical knowledge are omitted. The editors claim that they have produced, not a volume of selections but the Bible itself, shortened, but only by the omission of portions that do not 'count.'

The conventional order of the books is retained, and perhaps this was inevitable. But we may be thankful that chapters and verses are discarded and the paragraph system is employed. The chapters and verses are, however, indicated at the top of the page and titles given to help the reader along. The printing and binding are excellent. With such editors and publishers we might be certain of receiving a good book, and that is what we have. And we are grateful. But when shall we have a 'shortened Bible,' well printed, at (say) half a crown?

---

#### DR. WALLACE WILLIAMSON.

An interesting volume of sermons which will certainly be read largely in Scotland, and even 'furth of Scotland,' is *The Glorious Gospel* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It is a collection of twenty-four sermons by the late Very Rev. Andrew Wallace Williamson. Dr. Wallace Williamson had great intellectual gifts, and he had a dignified and impressive style. We have quoted one of the sermons, and it will be found in 'The Christian Year.' Some of the qualities of Dr. Wallace Williamson's preaching will be seen in it, though possibly a little of the beauty of the language may have been detracted from by the abridgement which has been necessary. Dr. A. W. Fergusson of Dundee is to be congratulated on the Memoir which he has prefixed to the volume, and also on

the excellent arrangement of the sermons. Dr. Williamson's first sermon is given here, his last at St. Cuthbert's, and his first at St. Giles'. A number have been selected also from those which he preached on special occasions, and in time of war. So one is able to trace in them the progressive development of Dr. Wallace Williamson's own matter and style.

We cannot refrain from quoting the first two paragraphs of Dr. Fergusson's Memoir. The whole of it runs only to ten pages, but it gives an excellent picture of Dr. Williamson. 'While the biography of Dr. Wallace Williamson is being written by Lord Sands this brief sketch may serve to introduce the preacher, and to indicate to readers furth of Scotland his commanding place and influence in the life of our Church and Nation.

'The story of our Church of Scotland contains no such romance in modern times as that of the career of Andrew Wallace Williamson. To-day, a student from a humble country home working his way through college as so many of his countrymen have done in every generation; to-morrow, within a year of licensing, ordained to the great parish of North Leith with a membership of two thousand; and the day after, literally seventeen months after, called to be colleague to the great MacGregor of St. Cuthbert's in the largest congregation and the foremost preaching pulpit of Scotland: so in his twenty-seventh, *per saltum*, he came to his throne. And during the next twenty-seven years he grew so steadily in pulpit power and spiritual influence that when the Cathedral of St. Giles became vacant in 1909, it was by the universal voice of the Church of Scotland, hardly less than by the vote of the congregation, that he was declared the only possible successor to Dr. Cameron Lees. Thus "by natural selection and the grace of God," as Professor W. P. Paterson put it, he came to be "Archbishop" of our Church in Scotland, and for fifteen years he reigned among us as our most representative Churchman, our outstanding pulpit voice, and our acknowledged leader in the things of the Kingdom.'

---

#### HOMES OF THE PSALMS.

Mr. Stacy Waddy, M.A., has written a thoroughly useful book, with the above title, on the Psalms (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), useful for the vividness with which it carries us into the original meaning and scenery of the Psalms, and useful as perhaps the most interesting presentation, in readily accessible form, of an approach to the Psalter, which is appeal-



ing more and more to the mind of modern scholars. Following the lead of the late Dr. Peters in his 'The Psalms as Liturgies,' he treats the Psalms not as historical poems composed for particular occasions, but as orders of service suitable for occasions which were constantly recurring, either in the ecclesiastical calendar or in the cycle of national vicissitudes. Their liturgical quality is frequently suggested by interpolated rubrics which have unfortunately been regarded as parts of the Psalms themselves: for example, 68<sup>12-14</sup> indicate the opening words of five anthems to be sung by the women's choir; 87<sup>7</sup> is a direction to the singers and pipers to strike up with the anthem, 'All my fountains are in Thee'; 118<sup>27</sup> is an instruction to bind the sacrifice, at this point in the service, with cords at the horns of the altar.

But more striking still is the allocation of the various collections of Psalms to various shrines, of which the four greatest were Jerusalem, Dan, Bethel, and Shechem. The Asaph group (50, 73-83) is assigned to Bethel and claimed as pre-exilic; the group 51-72 is assigned to Shechem; and the Korah group (42-49, 84-89), with its abundant references to water (cf. 42), is assigned to Dan, near the source of the Jordan; and all the Psalms, it is contended, gain enormously when read in the light of the scenery within which they were born. The processional use of certain typical Psalms (for example, 68 and 24) is vividly and convincingly outlined, and Mr. Waddy may be held to have proved his case that, if the later use of the Psalms was devotional, their primary use was liturgical. Valuable also is his contention that the prophet and the priest were not necessarily at daggers drawn; the priest mediated through the liturgy the truths taught by the prophets.

---

#### THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF INDIA.

---

It is impossible to withhold admiration of the immense research and infinite pains that are being bestowed on the preparation of *The Cambridge History of India*, the third volume of which has just been published (Cambridge University Press; 42s.). This has been edited and largely written by Lieut.-Col. Sir Wolseley Haig, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., Lecturer in Persian in the University of London, with the assistance of Sir E. Denison Ross, C.I.E., Director of the School of Oriental Studies in that University, and other notable contributors. 'The rise of Islam is one of the marvels of history' is the first sentence in a volume of more than seven hundred pages in which the

struggle of Muhammadans and Hindus for ascendancy in India, Ceylon, and Burmah is described with such a wealth of detail that the reader feels that he has never before supped so full of every form of barbarism and horror. Statecraft was only a polite name for the most atrocious assassination, and war was always waged to the extermination of the defeated army. One is left in amazement at the apparent ease with which huge armies of mounted men on horses and on elephants, and of ill-armed infantry, were assembled only to be destroyed by the most ruthless savagery. As these countless hordes must have marched and counter-marched on their stomachs, how were they fed in a land where tens of thousands have perished of famine even despite all the resources of modern civilization? We have made Delhi the capital of our Indian Empire, and in this we have only followed the example of the conquering armies of Islam. There is nothing new under the sun; in our own time we have had a German Emperor who called himself 'the All Highest,' and as long ago as the twelfth century there was a Muhammadan ruler in India who assigned to himself the titles of 'Supreme Pontiff and Vicegerent of the God of heaven and earth.' We were wont to pride ourselves on the penny post, but in India a cheap postal system by horsemen or by runners existed from time immemorial. There is nothing quite so remarkable in this notable volume as the many pages it contains of more than fifty reproductions of the wonderful examples of Muhammadan and Hindu art and architecture to be found in all parts of India. Just as we stand in admiration of and amazement at our first cathedrals in this country, so must we marvel at the monuments of the age of barbarism. The bibliography and chronology are worthy of the book.

---

*Science from a Christian Standpoint*, by a Lawyer (Alden; 2s. 6d. net), is a brief but thoroughly competent and well-documented essay on the present relations of science and religion. The author writes with moderation and brings forward weighty reasons in support of his thesis 'that there is nothing in science which bars from the standpoint of reason Christian values of life.'

---

A particular aspect of the problem of authority is admirably treated by Mr. Philip S. Belasco in his *Authority in Church and State* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). Mr. Belasco is not so much con-



cerned with Protestant *versus* Catholic views as with the more fundamental problem of the individual *versus* society, organized as either State or Church. After an historical survey of the Quakers and a valuable exposition of their political ideas and a penetrating analysis of modern conditions in Church and State, the author concludes that the State can be strong only if it considers the conscience of its members, and the Church in its teaching must consider the actual thought of its members; both finding strength, not weakness, in the personal interests or creative ideas of their members.

There are few doctrines on behalf of which so impressive an array of witnesses can be called as crowd to testify for *Pre-Existence and Reincarnation* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). Pythagoras, Plato, Buddha, Plotinus, Philo, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, down to Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore—a theory with such sponsors must be considered seriously. Mr. Lutosławski declares that he is 'fully aware and absolutely certain of his many past human lives, extending over thousands and millions of years,' and that he intends 'to be reborn as many times as shall be necessary for the fulfilment of his aims,' one of which is that palingenesis be accepted as a dogma of the Church and as a proved scientific truth. It is a wearying prospect, that makes one tired even to think of it. And unfortunately this book does not seem likely to shorten greatly that huge self-imposed task stretching out illimitably into the future. There are the usual arguments—such as falling in love at first sight and the rest of them. But nothing new, except the account of Messianism, that brave creed of certain Poles, that it is the duty of their people to prepare itself to be a Messiah nation; and that they must be content to be reincarnated time on time till this great aim is worked out and fulfilled. It is all rather dull as stated here. But Mickiewicz is much greater than Buddha, we are told. Our author is desperately in earnest, and asks for letters from his readers if his book appeals to them.

In March of last year there was published the second volume of Professor Radhakrishnan's 'Indian Philosophy'—a large book running to eight hundred pages and dealing with many systems of thought that have cut deep into India's mind and soul.

The publishers have now reissued the most interesting portion of that work in a separate volume—*The Vedānta according to Sāṃkhya and Rāmānuja* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net). Sāṃkhya and Rāmā-

nuja are, of course, among the greatest names in Indian thought, and here is a scholarly and deeply interesting study of their deeply interesting teaching, and by one who is laying us under a great debt by sharing with us his profound and first-hand knowledge. But the book is not a new work, it is simply a reprint.

Mr. Edward Grubb has followed up his 'Christianity as Life' by another excellent volume entitled *Christianity as Truth* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). In it he develops the thesis that Christianity 'in essence is Religion in its highest and purest form—a form in which it cannot be stated but can only be lived; but that like all religion it necessarily tends to express itself in human language, and that this necessity gives rise to Theology, which, though always imperfect, can make real progress towards truth.' In the course of his exposition he deals in a thoughtful and suggestive way with such topics as the Divine Humanity of Christ, Personality in God, Prayer and Providence, Evolution and Redemption, the World Problem and the Christian Solution. In a concluding chapter he returns to the conception that Christianity can be verified only in experience. 'Christian living involves belief that the principle of love taught and lived by Jesus will work successfully in all departments of life, national and economic as well as personal and spiritual; and willingness to take the risk of applying it. Christianity began, and must continue, as a great venture of faith.'

*Overcoming Handicaps*, by Mr. Archer Wallace (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net), is the somewhat unattractive title of a really capital book for boys. It contains, in brief, the life stories of men who, in spite of severe handicaps, were able heroically to make good. Some of the names, like Beethoven and Faraday, R. L. Stevenson and Edison, are familiar, but the majority are less well known, and a number are chosen from among the illiterate emigrants from Central Europe to America. It is a book of tales to make young eyes sparkle and young hearts beat high.

A really suggestive book for ministers, a religiously satisfying book for laymen, and a book much above the average in intellectual grasp and spiritual insight—that is *The Idealism of Jesus*, by the Rev. John E. McIntyre, M.A. (Allenson; 6s. net). One comes across a book like this only once in a while. Its originality, its literary allusiveness, and its earnestness are alike refreshing. It consists of three parts—'expositions,' 'experiences,' and



'enlargements.' The first is devoted to a series of studies in the Person and message of Jesus, His 'Idealism,' His simplicity, His demand, His grace. The second has for its keynote the contention that experience is in religion the only final authority. Faith is its rational conclusion. The third part consists of 'enlargements' on these themes, or their application in religious thinking and in practice—the redemptive process in history, the individual conscience, the new society, and others. The chapters might have been sermons; at any rate, they may suggest excellent sermons to the right kind of clergyman. And any one who likes a good religious book will not be disappointed in this one.

A new and revised edition of *The Friend of Little Children*, by the Rev. J. Sinclair Stevenson (Blackwell; 7s. 6d. net), has been issued. The original edition was reviewed and commended in these columns, and it is only necessary to note the appearance of this new edition. It is a beautiful book, outwardly and inwardly, clearly printed and finely bound, and with many illustrations. It would make a suitable birthday present for a child.

*Japan and Christ*, by Mr. M. S. Murao, B.A., and Mr. W. H. M. Walton, M.A. (C.M.S.; 2s. 6d.), is an uncommonly able and informing book. Being the joint work of two colleagues, British and Japanese, it may be taken as authoritative on Japanese life and thought as well as on Christian mission work. It is historical in the main, but leads up to a careful discussion of present-day problems in Japan. The outlook is encouraging. 'Since the opening of the twentieth century Christianity in Japan has entered smoother waters. The general attitude has become more normal. The growth of the Church has been steady, if not rapid. In the course of twenty-five years the Christian population has nearly trebled.' Yet the division of Christian forces and the manifest infirmities of the Churches have led Mr. Kanzo Uchimura, one of the outstanding Christian personalities of Japan, to take the line 'that the Churches are one of the greatest hindrances to the advance of Christianity in Japan.'

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have published a book that will be welcomed by ministers of the Free Churches of all denominations, *Let us Worship God: A Book of Prayers for Divine Service*, by the Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, the newly appointed minister of Westminster Chapel, London (4s. 6d. net). It contains prayers for general worship,

under its various parts—for the offering, for choirs, for the sacraments, marriage, burial, the Christian year, New Year's Day, Harvest Thanksgiving, and the close of the year. An interesting feature is a series of prayers for national Saints' Days, including St. Kentigern, St. Columba, St. Andrew, as well as St. David, St. Patrick, and St. George, and All Saints and All Souls. Another addition is a section for directed silence in worship. The material is rich in quantity, and appears to be good in quality. Our criticism is that the prayers are too 'eloquent,' in parts too literary, and even too clever. Any suspicion of this tends to destroy the usefulness of a prayer for devotion. We find ourselves admiring the phraseology, or even criticising it, instead of praying. All the great prayers are severely simple. There can be no objection to modern turns of phrase. But literary prayers and eloquent prayers tend to damp down devotion.

This will probably prevent these prayers being used as they stand. But it need not prevent their being a great help and enrichment to those many ministers who feel that the conduct of public worship is their hardest task, and for whom the help offered here is just the kind of help they need.

Biblical chronology has a curious fascination for certain minds. The latest attempt to unravel its intricacies is *The Measured Times of the Bible*, by Mr. C. C. Ogilvy Van Lennep (Heath Cranton; 17s. 6d. net). The writer's purpose is to let the Bible unlock its own chronological secrets, with results which are sufficiently disconcerting to those who are familiar with the commonly accepted chronology, the fall of Babylon, for example, being assigned to 484 B.C. instead of 539. The book, which is crowded with columns of dates and Biblical references as well as with discussion, is compiled with much ingenuity and industry, and, unlike some books of the kind, is written without any animus against the 'critics'; but how remote it is from the modern standpoint may be gathered from the statement, which the writer thinks he has proved, that 'it was exactly four thousand complete years, without any fraction whatever, from the moment of Adam's Creation to the moment of the Birth of our Lord Jesus.'

Few men can publish more than a limited number of books without danger of repeating themselves uselessly. But to this temptation we may safely predict the Rev. James Reid of Eastbourne will not succumb. Mr. Reid is one 'of the pulpit voices

of our time that carries throughout and beyond the British Isles,' and yet, *In Touch with Christ*, his latest volume, which has just been issued by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (7s. 6d. net), is only his fourth. In 1921 there appeared 'The Victory of God,' a volume of sermons. This was followed by the Warrack Lectures, 'In Quest of Reality,' and in 1925, 'The Key to the Kingdom: A Study of the Beatitudes.' *In Touch with Christ* contains twenty sermons full of suggestive thought. The thought is enriched by imagination, and it is imagination controlled by scholarship. One of the sermons in abridged form will be found in 'The Christian Year.'

The Messianic idea in the Old Testament has often been competently treated, but few people can be familiar with the development of that idea throughout the centuries of the Christian era. This is the task which Dr. Abba Hillel Silver has set himself in his *History of Messianic Speculation in Israel* (Macmillan, New York; \$3.50). In a sketch which is as readable as it is learned he shows the power of the Messianic idea and traces its influence through the Talmudic period, the Muhammadan period, the period of the Crusades, and the subsequent centuries. Two points are of especial interest: (1) Jewish expectancy was connected in the most vital way with the great and critical events that were stirring the contemporary world, and (2) calculations of the date of the Messianic redemption were by some Jewish thinkers sternly opposed right through the ages, sometimes because they feared the demoralizing effects which would follow the failure to realize their hopes, sometimes because they genuinely believed that the events alluded to by the prophets had already taken place. The discussion never loses itself in generalities, but is sustained throughout upon quotations from the Rabbis. This is an illuminating sketch of a—to Christians, at any rate—relatively unfamiliar field.

*International Missionary Co-operation* (Milford; 3s. 6d. net) is volume seven of the Reports of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council. It deals exhaustively with a subject of vital importance for the evangelization of the world. The urgent need of international co-operation is pressed, an outline is given of the extent to which it has already been attained, and suggestions are made as to the spheres where it is most desirable and practicable. It is a report which merits, and will doubtless receive, the most careful study by missionary leaders in all lands.

Principal W. R. Halliday, of King's College, London, has issued *The Greek Questions of Plutarch, with a New Translation and Commentary* (Milford; 15s. net). These questions, which consist essentially of a collection of notes put together by Plutarch from his miscellaneous reading, do not possess any great literary interest or merit, but they are of importance as being our sole authority for a number of curious facts connected with Greek religion and Greek history. The Commentary gives a vast amount of information on the various Greek festivals, and explains many peculiarities of local religious practice. In this respect it may be useful to Biblical students, especially to those who are interested in the relationship of Christianity to the pagan religions. The Greek text, which is that of Wytténbach, is excellently printed, and the book has a good index.

We have received the teachers' helps for the lessons of 1929, published by the National Sunday School Union. They are, first, *The Concise Guide* for the Junior (graded) and International (uniform) lessons, by the well-known expert, Mr. E. H. Hayes. These are as good as ever and on the familiar lines of former years. An enormous amount of labour has been expended on the preparation of these notes. They are illuminated by excellent maps, and the guidance for teachers is given by one who is in touch with modern methods. The price is 3s. 6d. net, a very moderate price for such a volume. The *Notes on the Scripture Lessons* (3s. 6d. net), and the *Notes on the Morning Lessons* (2s. 6d. net), both by Mr. J. E. Feasey, are in their own way equally good. There is also a little booklet, *The International Lesson Pocket Notes*, by Mr. W. D. Bavin, a *multum in parvo*. Such excellent helps as these must greatly increase the efficiency of teaching in our Sunday schools. We can hardly imagine any teacher who uses them with any intelligence failing to be interesting.

In a series of chatty chapters entitled *Explorations at Sodom* (R.T.S.; 5s. net), Dr. Melvin Grove Kyle describes with some vividness an expedition to Sodom by way of Kerak in Moab, whose governor furnished the company with a military escort. As there were distinguished archaeologists, geologists, and Semitic scholars in the company, the conclusions which they drew from their observations and investigations are worthy of attention. The chief conclusions are that Sodom and Gomorrah were situated at the south end of the Dead Sea, and that the catastrophe which overtook them occurred in the early part of the eighteenth century



B.C. What happened may have been that the cities were shattered by an earthquake, that the ground on which they stood was so depressed as to be covered by the waters of the sea, and that the conflagration which probably accompanied the earthquake was increased by the ejection of oil or bitumen from the earth. Traces of a submerged forest were visible, and about five miles from the nearest town on the plain was discovered what appeared to be the great High Place of Sodom and Gomorrah. Dr. Kyle expects that in a few years cruising on the Dead Sea will be a favourite sport of the globe-trotters. His experience has dissipated the legend about the absolute lifelessness of this region. 'When we came,' he says, 'to the mouth of the river we found millions of little fish swimming about in the edge of the sea.' Dr. Kyle has done archaeological work before, though it was perhaps hardly necessary to tell us three times that he had found an inscription of Rameses the Great at the Luxor temple in 1908, in which that monarch boasts of having conquered Moab (pp. 43, 79, 136). But his book will be read with interest, not least by those who look hopefully to archæology for confirmation of Bible narratives.

*The New Paganism*, by the Rev. Alfred Thomas, M.A., F.R.S.L. (Scott; 3s. 6d. net), is a volume of addresses given to various societies and published in various periodicals on present-day tendencies and problems. These include the Sunday question, Rotary, Churchgoing, War, and the Union of the Churches. A vigorous mind is dealing with all these topics and in a pronounced evangelical spirit. The addresses are worth reading, though the author tends to overstress his points. In arguing for Sunday observance, for example, he roundly states that Christ left the Fourth Commandment in full force, and that He changed the Day thus to be celebrated from the last one of the week to the first. He did so by His Resurrection and appearances on that day. This kind of statement rather detracts from a case than strengthens it. But that is a detail. The book as a whole is sound and helpful, and will help on the causes the author has at heart.

Here is a fine idea. And it nearly comes off. *Essays Catholic and Missionary* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net) is a series of studies of the problems and practical difficulties that face men and women in the Foreign Field, written with inside knowledge by picked writers. Could anything be more helpful for those setting their faces toward this life-work, or indeed for the Home Churches as a

whole? Unfortunately the essays are far from reaching a uniform standard of usefulness. Some, such as that of Bishop Lucas of the Tanganyika Territory, on the Christian Approach to Non-Christian Customs, are quite strikingly wise and suggestive. Some, however (need one name them?), come out of a conception of the Church so petty and parochial as to be quite unworthy. Yet others, like the contribution of Bishop Loyd of Nasik, have a width and statesmanship of outlook and a catholicity of heart refreshing in a somewhat stuffy atmosphere. Anglo-Catholics will like the book the most; for it is written more or less from their point of view.

So many books have been written on the Parables that it might well appear a bold undertaking to add another to the number. But *The Parables of Jesus*, by Mr. W. H. Robinson, Ph.D. (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net), is a book *sui generis*, and is worthy of a cordial welcome. It does not attempt a detailed interpretation of the individual parables. Its purpose is different, namely, to discuss the Parables as a whole in their essential nature, in their relation to the inner life and thought of Jesus, and as mirrors of His environment. The writer has given much serious study and reverent thought to his subject. His conclusion is that each of the Parables took its rise out of some historic situation, and was intended to give a direct and simple lesson bearing on that situation, but embodying principles valid for all time. He deals at some length with the suggestion that the Parables were meant to conceal as well as to reveal the truth, but he finds none of the offered explanations quite adequate, and he has no new explanation of his own to offer. 'He can only say that nothing is acceptable to him which clouds in the least degree what to him is the clear result of long study, that is, the conviction that the Parables of Jesus were brief stories or comparisons spontaneously arising in His soul from day to day, and flashed forth with kaleidoscopic variations at each new turn which fresh occasion gave to His divine passion to bring His Kingdom of God into soul after soul and to unite all souls under its redeeming power.'

*Jesus as He Was*, by Mr. F. M. Blakiston (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), is a very fresh and readable book, although it belongs to a type of writing which is rather in danger of being overdone. The substance of the book is not really Jesus as He was, but 'Jesus as I imagine He would have been if He had been born in this wonderful twentieth

century.' He would have been a pacifist, but not a socialist; He would have called on the Churches to relax the marriage law; of course, He would no longer have believed in demon possession, and, equally of course, He would have placed His hopes on evolutionary progress. There are times when one grows weary, very weary, of all this modern homage to the human Jesus—homage which is really patronage. To assert that 'to His immediate contemporaries, and during the actual days of His ministry, Jesus appeared as a human being pure and simple' is contrary to all evidence. The Christian faith from the first was based on the confession of Jesus as Lord.

In *The Teacher of Mankind* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), a small book on the teaching of Jesus, Mr. W. A. Russell, M.A., realizes the difficulties of arriving at certainty as to what Jesus actually said. He takes up so much space with Biblical criticism and the historical Jesus that he has not room to handle his great topics of God and eternal life, the struggle for existence, the family, the individual, and the origin of the Church, with anything like adequacy. We get too many not very pointed quotations, and too little of Mr. Russell, who, we are sure, is worth knowing.

## Bible Quotations and Chinese Customs.

BY RABBI JULIUS J. PRICE, M.A., PH.D., NEW YORK.

SCHLEIERMACHER has well remarked that 'no religion is wholly new, as the same basic ideas reappear in all.'<sup>1</sup> And if one considers the universality of some practices,<sup>2</sup> one might believe that it points to a time when the ancestors of all nations lived together and so derived the knowledge from a common source. But in spite of this fact, each religion tries to realize that only in its respective religious consciousness can the truth be possessed.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, if we examine the sacred books of the three great religions of the world, it becomes evident even to the most casual observer that there are common basic ideas in all of them. It is now an accepted fact, advanced by theologians, that Christianity borrowed not only from Judaism but also from the pagan cults with which it came in contact.<sup>4</sup> Muhammadanism in its turn borrowed from both Judaism and Christianity. And so we could continue comparisons<sup>5</sup> to show that no religion alone 'is wholly new, as the same basic idea reappears in all.'

In the light of such facts it is not to be wondered at, then, that on comparing the sacred writings and customs of the Chinese with those of the Old

and New Testaments,<sup>6</sup> a similitude of thought as well as of ideas becomes evident to the student.<sup>7</sup> The following few examples will illustrate this contention.<sup>8</sup>

In Is 57<sup>6</sup>, we read, 'Among the smooth stones of the stream is thy portion; they, they are thy lot: even to them hast thou poured a drink offering, thou hast offered a meat offering.' The worship of smooth stones<sup>9</sup> is attested by many ancient writers to have been an outstanding feature in the character of heathen worship. Theophrastus well remarked that 'passing by the anointed stones in the streets, the heathen takes out his vial of oil, pours it on them, and having fallen on his knees and made his adoration, he departs.' Among the Semites<sup>10</sup> there must have been a belief that a

<sup>6</sup> See Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*.

<sup>7</sup> Baron von Hügel, *Mystical Elements of Religion*, vol. i. ch. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Loisy, *The Religion of Israel*, 50.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Talmud: 'R. Simon ben Yochai said, A precious stone was worn round the neck by our father Abraham, and every sick man who beheld it was restored to health. When our father Abraham died God suspended the stone from the sun. Abbaye said, This accounts for the proverb, when the sun rises the illness decreases.'—*Baba Bathra*, 16B.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Gn 28; also the Greek *boe-lutus*. The Phœnicians also worshipped stones in the Temple of Melkart at Tyre, cf. Herod., ii. 44.

<sup>1</sup> Stade, *Akademische Reden*, etc., 57. Giessen, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., e.g., Lansdell, *The Tithe in Scripture*, 18.

<sup>3</sup> Hegel's *Geschichte der Religion*, vol. i. ch. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (*passim*).

<sup>5</sup> Reinach, *Orpheus: A History of Religions* (*passim*).



stone was the habitation of the deity. Herodotus<sup>1</sup> tells us that the Arab had great reverence for stones. He must worship every white and beautiful stone, and when it was impossible to find such, he was so crude as to worship a hill of sand. Before departing on a journey, the Arab would take with him four stones, three of which were to serve the purpose of a hearth, the fourth to be used as an idol. In cases where stones were not available, the Arab while on the road would worship any stones or heap of sand that he found in the neighbourhood.<sup>2</sup> 'The adoration of stones among the Ishmaelites,' says Ibn Ishak, 'originated in the custom of men carrying a stone from the sacred enclosure of Mecca; where they went they set it up and made circuits round about it as about the Kaaba, till at last they adored every goodly stone they saw, forgot their religion, and changed the faith of Abraham and Ishmael into the worship of stones.' The Deuteronomic historian regarded the downfall of the people as due to the erecting of stones by Judah in Israel.

In China, a water-worn stone elevated upon a rude altar represented the *shayshn*, or gods of the land. Before this altar, incense sticks were constantly burned. Every village and every street of twenty-five families erected one of these altars, and in the spring and autumn worshipped the deities supposed to be enshrined upon it. These gods were held in particular veneration by the agricultural classes, who with the aid of the priests invoked a blessing upon the season at certain times. The priests, three or four in number, not loath to perform so joyous a ceremony, arrived dressed in robes of yellow and green, accompanied by a few musicians with their instruments. They were attended by their employers, and a servant bearing a tray filled with cakes, preserves, and meats preceded them, followed by another carrying several small cups and a can of spirits. On approaching the altar the eatables were presented before the stones, and then the priests made a libation before and upon it of three cups of spirits. At the sound of a flourish upon a gong and trumpet, the priest mumbled over the prescribed form of blessing upon the neighbouring fields, which was not understood by reason of its rapid enunciation. After the prayer, a second libation was sometimes poured out before the priest and attendants passed on to the next altar. During this ceremony, great

glee was manifested by all spectators, caused no doubt by the seemingly good humour of the priest. The landlord, considering the expense incurred, did not show so jovial a countenance. One can almost imagine a similar custom to have existed in the days of Isaiah.

In Pr 25<sup>3</sup> we read as follows: 'The heaven for height, and the earth for depth, and the heart of kings is unsearchable.' In comparing the following aphorism from the Ming-sin Paou Keen, we seem to find the very same thought. Here we read, 'The fish dwell in the bottom of the water, and the eagles in the sides of heaven; the one though high may be reached by an arrow, and the other though deep may be angled for; but the heart of man at only a cubit's distance cannot be known. Heaven can be spanned, earth can be fathomed, but the heart of man cannot be measured.'

In Ec 7<sup>6</sup> we read, 'For as the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of the fool.' The coarse grass which grows upon the hillsides in the islands about Macao is used by the poor Chinese as a substitute for wood, which is too expensive for cooking purposes. It consists for the most part of a species of Andropogon. The natives cut it in the autumn and store it in bundles for winter's use. In its unsubstantial nature it resembles the dry thorns used for fuel in Judæa, and its crackling blaze and great flame and noise, giving no heat in the burning of coals or in the embers, reminds one of the laughter of a fool.

In Job 19<sup>23, 24</sup> we read, 'Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever!' Engraved rocks, to commemorate remarkable events, are seen in China, though not in such vast numbers as in Persia and India. This is explained by the fact that the literature of the Chinese obviates the necessity for such crude expressions of commendation. The smoothened surface of rocks in Asitu, when they lie in spots esteemed lucky, are engraved with characters under the direction of geomancers or *fung-shuany* doctors. Characters of this order are supposed to exert a beneficial influence upon the surrounding country. Great skill is often displayed in the cutting of the sentences and names on the pillars and door-posts of the temples. These inscriptions are employed to commemorate distinguished and honoured individuals, but often are merely used for ornament's sake. Just as the Romans anciently published their Twelve Tables, so the Chinese government also employed this mode of establishing laws and regulations. The char-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Herod., iii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Can this be a remnant of the Canaanites' custom against which the Deuteronomic Code was issued? Cf. Dt 12<sup>8</sup>, also 16<sup>22</sup>.

acters are plainly and deeply engraved upon the marble, and the slab is set up in a conspicuous place, in such a manner as to shelter it from the destroying influence of climatic conditions.

If we turn to the New Testament and compare several of the customs alluded to therein with those of the Chinese, we shall be able to find a very similitude between them and those of the inhabitants of the great Chinese Empire. The more we examine the old in a new illustration, the more we become aware of their exactitude.

In Mt 6<sup>7</sup> we read, 'But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions as the heathen do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.' The following passage from the books of the Buddhists may show why such a caution had to be given by the writers of the New Testament as well as by later Chinese authorities. It is supposed to be a canon delivered by Fuh to be repeated for the prevention of all misfortunes and for the attaining of life in the world to come. The prayer is supposed to be repeated three times. It reads as I have it before me: 'Nan-mo O-me-to po-yay, to-ta-kae-to-yay, to-te-yay-ta, O-me-le-too po-kwan, O-me-le-to, seeh-tan-pokwan, O-me-le-to, kwan-ke-lant-te: kea-me-ne, kea-ke-na, chio-to-ke-le po-po-ha.' This prayer is unintelligible to the average Chinaman. It is stated on very good authority that not one out of every hundred priests in China understands it. It is composed of bare sounds of Sanskrit words expressed as nearly as possible by Chinese words. The order of procedure with regard to this prayer was as follows: while the priest would repeat the prayer very quickly, another priest would beat upon a drum in order to arouse the god. This drum was always made of wood, inasmuch as it was a common belief that the evil spirit could not attack a drum made of wood. The above jumbled phrases were mumbled in a miserable fashion by the Chinese priest. Translated as well as possible, they mean, 'The God Omoto (Amita) rests on top of the heads of those who repeat this prayer in order to save them from their enemies, to render them safe and comfortable in life, and to confer on them any mode of future existence which they may at the hour of death desire.' I have been informed, if the prayer is recited thirty myriad times, the person reciting it can have anything he desires and will be sure to be at no distance from the personal vision of the god Oeto. Later Chinese theologians as well as the author of the above-quoted New Testament verse began to condemn those who repeated their prayers innumera-ly.

But to proceed. In Mt 20<sup>3</sup>, we read, 'And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the market-place.' If one were to pass through the streets of Peking or Canton, one would be impressed with the crowds of porters or coolies waiting at the most public corners in the hope of a day's labour, or of being hired for a week or more. Each individual or couple is provided with a carrying pole and a pair of rope slings; and with these they perform all the services which fall to their lot. They are divided into companies and claim to do all the portage in their districts. In such towns where the coolies are hired by the month, these men often stand idle the livelong day, through want of employment.

In Mk 7<sup>11</sup>, we read, 'But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free.' In China, it is the custom for Buddhist priests to take an entire farewell of their parents or other relations, or, as they express it, *chuh kea*, 'to go out of the family,' and separate themselves from the world. They no longer owe any duty to their parents, or, according to their doctrine, 'have ought to do for their father or mother.' But this tenet is as directly opposed to the ethics of Confucius as to the Fifth Commandment, and is consequently practised by none other than the devotees of Buddha. It is among the Buddhists, as it was among the Pharisees, an unnatural doctrine of the sect.

In Lk 6<sup>38</sup>, we read, 'Good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom.' The Chinese, Japanese, and Loochooan costume consists of a number of long robes similar to nightgowns, which overlap in front and are secured by a girdle at the waist. One of the gowns is fashioned and used extensively to carry articles. These capacious receptacles often hold writing materials, tobacco, pipe, and pouch, and numerous other commodities, without inconveniencing the wearer. The Ancient Greeks and Hebrews were also accustomed to carrying articles in this manner. And it is the marvel of the careful observer that they are able to appear so well in such uncomely garments.

In Jn 2<sup>14</sup> we read, '... and the changers of money sitting.' The practice referred to here, of persons keeping small tables where money can be changed, is more common in China, perhaps, than in any of the several Asiatic countries where it is in vogue. Those who engage in this profession usually provide themselves with a small table about three feet long by fifteen inches wide and



establish it in any busy thoroughfare. The market, temple, and street corner prove their particular haunts, and the garrulousness of the moneylender adds to the general confusion of the street noises. The strings of copper cash, often secured to the

table by a chain, are piled up on one side, and the silver, together with the small ivory yard with which it is weighed, is kept in drawers. Their sign is a wooden figure carved in the form of a cylinder, to represent a string of cash.

## Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A., B.D., RIPON.

### IV.

#### PART II. (*continued*).

##### B. One Sanctuary or Many?

IN the preceding article we dealt with Wiener's first main criticism of Wellhausen's position. We saw that that criticism broke down under examination, and that the available evidence fully justified the conviction that in Old Israel the slaughter of domestic animals and sacrifice were normally coincident. We come now to the second indictment. Wellhausen asserted that in Old Israel there was a 'multiplicity of sanctuaries,' and that 'for the earliest period of the history of Israel, all that precedes the building of the Temple, not a trace can be found of any sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy.' And, even when Solomon built his royal sanctuary, 'we nowhere find that that king sought to abolish all the others.' 'The restriction of worship to a single selected place was unknown to any one, even as a pious desire.'<sup>1</sup>

This position Wiener declares to be an 'incredible blunder,' due to two causes. We have already dealt with one of these, viz. the neglect of relevant passages (see Art. III., introductory page). The second is 'the hopeless mental confusion induced by gratuitously calling various places and objects "sanctuaries"' (*Essays*, pp. 179, 187). The truth is, Wiener says, that we must distinguish between lay-altars, built of earth or unhewn stones, which might be erected anywhere, and the horned altar, built of hewn stones and with steps, which could be found only at the one legitimate sanctuary. At this latter altar only priests could sacrifice, whereas at the former any layman might so do. The lay altars were pre-Mosaic in origin. Moses did not attempt to get rid of them—in fact he

offered at such himself—but he regulated them and, side by side with the primitive usage, he set up the new usage of the Tabernacle. Wiener enlarges on the obvious difference between a mound (or cairn) and a house (with horned altar), and then proceeds: 'The stoutest opponent of the higher critics would have thought it impossible that they could be so hopelessly incompetent as to be unable to distinguish between a mound and a house, and that merely because they had called both these objects "sanctuaries," but unfortunately the facts admit of no doubt' (*Essays*, p. 187 note).

[Wiener is so pleased with this supposed exposure of the 'hopeless incompetence' of the higher critics that he repeats it over and over again in his various writings. The latest and perhaps the most flagrant of these is in an article on 'The Need of a Jewish Biblical Scholarship,'<sup>2</sup> in which he says: 'When I came to Biblical studies, I found the great Kuenen and his disciples busily engaged in piercing the ear of a slave (Ex 21<sup>6</sup>) to the door or doorpost of a mound of earth or stones which they had called a sanctuary and then mistaken for a house. The way it came about was this. In Ex 20<sup>24</sup> they had found a law which permits the erection of a number of altars. They then called these altars "sanctuaries." . . . Having labelled them sanctuaries, the critics became the victims of their own terminology. Sanctuaries were generally houses and have doors or door-posts. Mounds of earth or stone have not. But the philologists and theologians were too confused to know the difference, and so in every rationalist lecture-room, the mounds sprouted doors under the wonder-working influence of

<sup>1</sup> *Prolegomena*, pp. 17–22. And see above Art. I. A, I. 2, and Art. II. B, I.

<sup>2</sup> Sent me in MS., and which I understand is to be published in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte . . . des Judentums*.

critics living thousands of years after the events of which they spoke. Nobody will be so ungenerous as to grudge rationalism its miracles; but sensible men must be excused for regarding their scholarship as fit for nothing but the comic opera stage.†]

A man who can write such stuff and nonsense as this, and speak in such manner of scholars of the front rank, must not be surprised if these men, who weigh their words and who seek to conduct controversy in a reputable manner, decline to take any notice of his writings. Needless to say, 'the critics' do not make any such mistake. Whether 'before God' in Ex 21<sup>6</sup> means 'at the sanctuary' is open to question (see Driver's and Peake's Commentaries, *ad loc.*), but that is not the question here. In Old Israel there were many 'high places' which in pre-exilic days were called 'sanctuaries' (Art. I. 4, I. 2). Such a typical high place as that at Ramah had permanent buildings (1 S 9<sup>22</sup>). Its 'guest-chamber' would seat thirty persons (same Hebrew word in Jer 35<sup>2ff.</sup>). It was these permanent high places, and not casual altars, which the critics, following Biblical usage, called sanctuaries. Wiener's charge, in fact, recoils on his own head. It is he, and not the critics, who confounds mound and house and treats such a sanctuary as that at Ramah as being nothing more than a mound of earth or stones. Must one not apply to him his own words: 'How can a man, who cannot distinguish between a stone and a house, claim to speak with authority on complicated questions of historical development?' (*Origin of the Pentateuch*, p. 63).

But now to business. We will consider in the rest of this article:

#### I. Wiener's arguments for one sanctuary.

Wiener agrees with Wellhausen on two points: (1) that Ex 20<sup>24</sup> declares a multiplicity of altars to be legitimate, and (2) that the history shows that such a multiplicity actually obtained; but he discounts this by asserting that from the beginning there was also (i) a single sanctuary, with (ii) a horned altar, where (iii) priests only could minister, and (iv) at which alone statutory sacrifices could lawfully be offered. What evidence does Wiener bring forward in support of this view?

1. His statement that a single sanctuary was in existence from the beginning is based upon four passages in JE (Ex 23<sup>19</sup> 34<sup>26</sup>, Jos 9<sup>23</sup> (27), Ex 21<sup>14</sup>). The expressions, 'the house of Jehovah thy God,' 'the house of my God,' and 'mine altar' prove, he says, that both the legislation and the narrative of JE recognize the existence of a 'house of

Jehovah' and show that 'pilgrimages to this house, and not to lay altars, are firmly established in the earliest legislation' (*Essays*, p. 183).

[We must note here a characteristic outburst on Wiener's next page. 'Wellhausen in his famous chapter on "The Place of Worship" professes to discuss the evidence of J (pp. 29-32). He has not detected Ex 23 or 34 or Jos 9. . . I have often asked partisans of Wellhausen, if they can show me any references to these passages in his discussion, but I never can get an answer.' If only Wiener had read the *Prolegomena* with any care, he would not have needed to ask this question, for on page 42 Wellhausen refers to Jos 9<sup>27</sup> in a footnote, and on p. 374 he discusses it for half a page. In Chap. III. p. 89, Ex 23<sup>19</sup> and 34<sup>26</sup> are quoted in full and discussed throughout the whole of the following page. Once more we see that Wiener charges his opponent with a neglect which is quite imaginary and is himself guilty of 'failure to collate the whole of the relevant evidence.']

That these passages refer to a 'house of Jehovah' is quite clear; that they refer to one sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy is the reverse of clear. If JE were homogeneous and if its date were known, the task of interpretation would be much easier; but while JE unquestionably contains very ancient materials, the dates at which they were written down in J and E and then later combined in JE are very difficult to determine. Dates as wide apart as the tenth and sixth centuries B.C. have been assigned to them (e.g. Sellin's *Introduction*, E.T. pp. 54 ff., and Kennett's *O.T. Essays*, pp. 6-9). Moreover, JE bears clear marks of editorial handiwork, Deuteronomic and Priestly. Careful scrutiny is therefore needed before adducing particular passages as evidence for the earliest times.

The phrase 'the house (a) of Jehovah,' or (b) 'of Jehovah thy God,' occurs very rarely in the early books ((a) 1 S 17 3<sup>15</sup> (Shiloh); (b) Ex 23<sup>19</sup> 34<sup>26</sup>, Dt 23<sup>18</sup>). 'The house of God' occurs in Gn 28<sup>17, 22</sup> (Jacob's pillar) and Jg 18<sup>31</sup> (Shiloh); cf. Jos 9<sup>23</sup> ('house of my God'), Jg 17<sup>5</sup> R.V.m. 18<sup>14</sup> (Micah). [In Jos 6<sup>24</sup> LXX omits 'the house.' For Jg 19<sup>18</sup> see R.V.m.] It occurs with equal rarity in the earlier literary prophets: Am 7<sup>13</sup>, 'the house of the kingdom' (Bethel); Hos 9<sup>4</sup>, cf. vv. 8, 15 (northern sanctuaries); Mic 4<sup>1, 2</sup>=Is 2<sup>2, 5</sup> (Zion). [Is 37<sup>1, 14</sup> 38<sup>20, 22</sup>=2 K 19<sup>1, 14</sup> 20<sup>5, 8</sup>.] But when we come to Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel we find the phrase in very frequent use (Kings one hundred and fifty-seven, Jeremiah forty-one, Ezekiel sixty-three times) and always meaning the Temple, in



fact or in vision. Now Samuel and Kings (in all probability originally one) were compiled by one or more contemporaries of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. 1 S 1-3 describes the sanctuary at Shiloh as a 'house' with doors, but the writer to whom we owe 2 S 7 knows of no 'house' before the days of David (v. 6 and cf. 1 K 3<sup>2</sup>). What, then, are we to understand by 'the house' or 'altar of Jehovah' in the passages adduced by Wiener? We will take them in order.

(i) Ex 26<sup>23</sup> 22<sup>29-30</sup> 23<sup>12-19</sup> cover the same ground as 34<sup>17-26</sup>, and the two seem to be E's and J's versions of 'the words of Jehovah' (24<sup>8</sup>). The editor, who found room for both in JE, appears to have assimilated them to one another (esp. in 23<sup>18, 19</sup> 34<sup>26, 26</sup>). The phrase 'Jehovah thy God' occurs two hundred and thirty-one times in Deuteronomy, and the particular phrase 'the house of Jehovah thy God' is found in Dt 23<sup>18</sup>, while the context exhibits many Deuteronomic phrases (e.g. Ex 23<sup>15</sup> 34<sup>20</sup> = Dt 16<sup>1, 16</sup>; 23<sup>17</sup> 34<sup>28</sup> = Dt 16<sup>16</sup>; 34<sup>24</sup> = Dt 4<sup>38</sup> (Heb.) and six times, and Dt 12<sup>20</sup> 19<sup>8</sup>). Probably, therefore, 'the house . . . thy God' comes from a Deuteronomic writer and means the Temple. If, however, it should be due to an earlier writer, it would naturally mean at the time the nearest place of pilgrimage, but would later be read in accordance with the then current meaning.

(ii) Jos 9. The Gibeonites are condemned to provide bondmen for v. 23 'the house of my God,' v. 27 'the altar of Jehovah.' It is noteworthy that (1 K 3<sup>4</sup>) Solomon went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great 'high place,' and that Ezekiel (44<sup>7-9</sup>) denounces the bringing in of uncircumcised aliens to keep the charge of God's sanctuary. It would seem that Gibeonite bondmen served at the local 'house of God,' now converted to Jehovah-worship, and that this bond-service was later carried over to the Temple at Jerusalem.

(iii) Ex 21<sup>14</sup>. Wiener is perfectly right in saying (*The Main Problem of Deuteronomy*, pp. 12-13) that 'mine altar' cannot here mean any casual altar of earth or stones, but neither can it mean a single sanctuary altar for the whole land. The asylum, to be of any use, must have been within reach of the fugitive manslayer, and it is most reasonable to regard 'mine altar' as being that at the nearest recognized sanctuary of Jehovah.

With the best will in the world, on such shaky foundations as are provided in Wiener's four passages it is impossible honestly to build up the thesis that from the beginning in Old Israel there was one sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy. And,

on the contrary, as we shall see in the next article, there is abundant evidence that there were many sanctuaries.

2. Wiener next brings evidence to show that 'at any rate as far back as the days of David and Solomon' there stood 'before the ark' a 'horned altar.' First Adonijah, and then Joab (1 K 1<sup>50f.</sup> 2<sup>28ff.</sup>), fleeing for sanctuary, 'caught hold of the horns of the altar.' In Joab's case this altar is said to have been 'in the tent of Jehovah.' Here, according to Wiener, we have clear proof of the truth of his thesis (*Essays*, p. 182). Two difficulties, however, arise: (a) it is precarious to trust to a statement by the author of Kings as proving what was the nature of the altar in 'the tent of Jehovah,' in the early days of King Solomon, seeing that the first compiler seems to have done his work after the death of Jehoiakim (2 K 24<sup>5</sup>), and therefore in speaking of the horns of the altar he may simply be reading back into earlier times the usage of his own day. And a further difficulty arises: (b) Where was this horned altar? Wiener says (p. 188) that 'the tent of Jehovah,' in which Joab found it, must have been the tent which David pitched for the ark at Jerusalem (2 S 6<sup>17</sup>), but, according to 1 K 3<sup>4</sup>, Gibeon was at that time 'the great high place,' and its altar was so large that Solomon offered upon it one thousand burnt-offerings. Is it likely that this great sanctuary was content with an altar of earth or unhewn stone, while the much smaller tent at Jerusalem had the superior horned altar? The author of Chronicles obviously thought otherwise. He states in the parallel passage to 1 K 3 (2 Ch 1<sup>8-6</sup>; cf. 1 Ch 16<sup>39</sup>) that the Mosaic 'tent of meeting' and 'the brazen altar which Bezalel made' were at Gibeon. But, if so, what becomes of Wiener's horned altar at Jerusalem? Could there have been two? The Chronicler is as convinced as Wiener that the Levitical worship was in full swing in 'the tent of meeting' in the wilderness, and he believes that the Tabernacle and the altar came in with Joshua, were preserved in David's time at Gibeon, and were finally deposited in the Temple at Jerusalem (2 Ch 5<sup>5</sup>), but his view will not square with Wiener's view that the sole legitimate sanctuary altar, in the years before the Temple was built, was in David's tent. Wiener will no doubt say that Chronicles is 'midrash' (see *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 284), and with good reason; but the Chronicler has sound sense on his side when he assumes that, if any sanctuary had 'the brazen altar,' it would be the great high place at Gibeon, and not David's tent at Jerusalem.

Wiener does acknowledge that there were 'horned altars' at what he regards as illegitimate sanctuaries (Am 3<sup>14</sup> proves that), but that does not shake his confidence that there was at any one time only one legitimate sanctuary and only one legitimate horned altar. There will not, however, be many who, having weighed his at the best very scanty evidence, will share that confidence.

[In the prophetic, poetic, and historical books altar 'horns' are mentioned in four passages: Am 3<sup>14</sup>, 'I will visit the altars of Bethel: and the horns of the altar shall be cut off'; Jer 17<sup>1</sup>, 'The sin of Judah . . . is graven upon the horns of your (R.V.m. 'their') altars' (see also v.<sup>2</sup>); Ps 118<sup>27</sup>, 'Bind the sacrifice with cords, even unto the horns of the altar'; and Ezk 43<sup>15, 20</sup>, 'from the altar-hearth and upward there shall be four horns.' In the Pentateuch (Ex 27-30, 37-38, Lv 4, 8, 9, 16, all P) the horns of the altar are mentioned eighteen times. By the time that P was written, no other kind of altar would have been thought possible.]

The passage in Amos proves that horned altars were in full use in the time of Jeroboam II. (about 760 B.C.). How far back we must go for their first introduction it is impossible to say. There is nothing incredible in the supposition that they had begun to appear in the larger sanctuaries as early as the end of David's reign (about 1000 B.C.); it is when we are asked to believe that Israel entered Palestine with such an altar and that it could be found only at one legitimate central sanctuary that we are compelled to part company with Wiener and to say that the evidence, literary and historical, points decisively the other way.

3. The third part of Wiener's position (B, I. above) is that at the altar of the supposed single sanctuary only priests could minister. This, of course, is what P lays down, but when we turn to the history (see Art. I. Part I. A, 4) we see that David himself, girded with a linen ephod, offered his offerings before Jehovah at the tent which he erected for the ark at Jerusalem, and blessed the people in the name of Jehovah of hosts (2 S 6<sup>17, 18</sup>). Even when the Temple was built, Solomon himself offered the great prayer, blessed all the assembly, hallowed the Temple court, and offered sacrifice (1 K 8). Was this, then, a lay altar? or, rather, is not Wiener's whole view an anachronism? It was not until long afterwards that ministrations at the altar at Jerusalem were hedged round by awful sanctions and declared inaccessible even to anointed kings. It is significant that the story of Uzziah's trespass in the Temple to burn incense

is to be found in Chronicles, not in Kings (2 Ch 26<sup>16ff.</sup>; cf. 2 K 15<sup>5</sup>).

The further question arises: Were not local altars at high places served by priests, although, according to Wiener, these altars were in the eyes of the law only lay altars? They certainly were in the days of Josiah, when every city of Judah seems to have had its high place and its priest (2 K 23<sup>5, 8</sup>), and there can be no doubt that at least the larger high places to which the people resorted from early days had priests in charge. Jeroboam was clearly following the custom of his day, when 'he made houses of high places and made priests' to serve in them (1 K 12<sup>31</sup>). This leads up to the question: What, in fact, was the status and what were the duties of a priest in the early days? Wiener clearly thinks of him, in accordance with the later idea, as chiefly concerned with sacrifice and Levitical ritual, but in the earliest days it would seem that slaughtering and pouring out the blood and the burning of the fat were carried out by the offerer himself (see Art. II. B, I.). But as soon as settled conditions permitted the establishment of permanent 'houses,' men had to be set apart to take charge of them. We may compare the primitive practice at local shrines in Syria to-day. S. I. Curtiss (*Primitive Semitic Religion To-Day*, chap. 12) writes: 'There is virtually a priesthood in existence, called Sheiks of certain shrines, or servants of certain saints. . . . They keep the shrine in order. They slay, if the offerer does not wish to do so himself. They are supported in part at least by the sacrifices brought to the "makam"' (= Heb. for 'place,' Dt 12<sup>5, 11, 13</sup>, etc.). Two words used to describe priestly functions show the early conception—'minister' (שָׁרַת) and 'keep' (שָׁמַר). The former is used in civil life of higher domestic service, of royal officers, of Joshua's service to Moses, and Elisha's to Elijah; and so in ecclesiastical life Samuel, e.g., is said to 'minister' unto or before Jehovah (1 S 2<sup>18, 31</sup>). Wiener, with his anachronistic ideas of a priest's duties in Old Israel, writes in his *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 264: 'It stands to reason that the child can have performed no priestly duties whatever, though doubtless he ran errands and performed odd jobs for Eli as a kind of page.' But, as a matter of fact, opening and closing of the doors (3<sup>16</sup>), caring for 'the lamp of God,' placing bread before the presence (21<sup>6</sup>), cleaning 'the house,' with its guest-chamber (where such parties as Elkanah's ate the sacrificial feast) and its precincts, were precisely 'priestly duties' in Samuel's day. (In 1 S 2<sup>15, 16</sup> it is not clear who burnt the fat.) In Deuteronomy שָׁרַת



occurs five times, and in all five it is used of priestly duties, including that of blessing in the name of Jehovah (10<sup>6</sup> 17<sup>12</sup> 18<sup>5, 7</sup> 21<sup>6</sup>), and the same usage is found in connexion with both priests and Levites in the later writings and in P (Ex 30<sup>20</sup>, Nu 3<sup>31</sup>, etc. etc.). Another duty is brought out by the second word (שמר). When the ark was brought into the house of Abinadab the men of Kirjath-Jearim 'sanctified' his son to 'keep' it. In the same way 'such an image as that of Gideon or Micah (Jg 8<sup>26, 27</sup> 17<sup>4, 5</sup>) was well worth stealing,' and needed a priest as guardian over it. This verb is used in P of both priests and Levites (Nu 18<sup>5, 7</sup>, and 3<sup>, 4</sup>; cf. 2 K 25<sup>18</sup>, Ezk 44<sup>14-16</sup>). A third duty of the priests in Old Israel was to give oracular answers to those who came to inquire of God (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 130). So

Abiathar came down to David with an ephod in his hand, and David through him 'inquired of Jehovah' (1 S 23<sup>6, 9-13</sup>, 2. 4 14<sup>3, 18</sup> R.V.m. 22<sup>10</sup> with 21<sup>9</sup> 30<sup>7</sup>). [In 1 S 14<sup>3</sup> 22<sup>28</sup> 22<sup>18</sup> the Heb. means 'carry' or 'bear,' not 'wear,' and the ephod is clearly a small image and not the 'linen ephod' of 2<sup>18</sup>, Ex 28<sup>6</sup>. In 22<sup>18</sup> 'linen' is wanting in the LXX, and we should read 'ephod-bearing men.']

This giving of oracular answers developed into the giving of 'torah,' i.e. teachings and decisions on moot points of law and order (Dt 33<sup>10</sup> etc.). And, when daily sacrifices were inaugurated in national sanctuaries, of necessity the priests themselves slaughtered sacrificially.

4. Wiener's fourth contention, viz. that statutory sacrifices could be sacrificed only at the central sanctuary, will be discussed in Art. VI.

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

#### *Refusing the Easy Way out.*

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,  
GLASGOW.

'Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance.'—He 11<sup>35</sup>.

THERE is one thing written very plainly across the pages of the Bible, and that is that God is our Deliverer. The Bible is a book of deliverances. Its histories tell us how God delivered Israel from Egypt, David from Saul, the Jews from captivity, Daniel from the lions, Peter and Paul and Silas from prison. Its Psalms are prayers for deliverance, and thanksgivings because God heard those who called on Him and delivered them from all their distresses. Its prophets preach the hope of a Deliverer who should come some day; and when Jesus came at last, He said He was come to 'preach deliverance to the captives.' His very name 'Jesus' means 'Deliverer.'

Yet in one place, when the writer is exulting in the long list of those whom God had delivered, he goes on to say, 'Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance.'

What does this mean? That they refused God's way of deliverance? No! It means that they refused a way of deliverance because it was not God's way. There was a way out, an easy way, but they refused to take the easy way out.

It means that it is a fine thing to trust God to deliver you in trouble, but it is a finer thing to go on trusting Him when He doesn't deliver you; and so the Bible puts high in the list of its heroes those who refused the easy way out.

What splendid pages of history these people have written! I see the disciples brought before the very man who had put Jesus to death and who had power to put them to death. He forbids the disciples to preach about Jesus. Peter answers that they 'must obey God rather than man,' and faces the consequences boldly. The easy way was just to be quiet, but they didn't take it. I see the early Christians. They were only asked to cast a pinch of incense on the altar of the Emperor: that was the easy way. The other way was the lions and the torture and death. Why not do the easy thing and confess Christ in their hearts? It meant peace and quietness. Some did it, but many others refused deliverance and were tortured. I see George Wishart and Patrick Hamilton in Scotland. They had the same choice: to hold their tongues and live unharmed, or to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ and face burning and the stake. They refused the easy way out, and were martyred at St. Andrews. I think of Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley; to all there was an easy way of escape: to deny Christ, to hold their peace, to forget their conscience; but, instead, they chose to be loyal to Christ and to conscience.

They were burned, and shot, and hanged, on the hills of Scotland, and in the market-places of England, and it thrills us to read of their courage and faithfulness. We admire them for their choice.

Now the Captain of all who choose to be true to their God and their conscience, whatever the consequences may be, is the Lord Jesus Christ. He chose the hard way though it led straight to the Cross. Peter, because he loved Jesus and couldn't bear to think of Him suffering, urged Him to take the easy way out. Jesus called Peter 'Satan' for suggesting it, and 'set his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem.' When He was tortured upon the Cross, the people said, 'He trusted in God that He would deliver Him. Let Him deliver Him. Let the Christ come down from the Cross.' And God didn't deliver Him; He died on that Cross.

Why didn't God deliver Jesus and all these others? I don't know. Only God knows. But I know that the world's history would have been a poorer thing if He had, and that it is richer because of their brave and heroic choice. The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church: the sufferings of the Covenanters put iron into the soul of Scotland; and the Cross of Christ is the salvation of the world.

Is there ever anything like this in your lives? Aren't you often tempted to take the easy way out? the shabby, cowardly, dishonourable way, because it is the easy way?

At school you have done something wrong. You are asked straight, 'Did you do it?' The master will take your word. The easy way is to say 'No,' to tell a lie and escape. No one will ever know but yourself and God. The other way is to tell the truth and take the consequences; certainly some punishment, for you have deserved it. *Take the hard way always.*

For one thing the easy way isn't really easy. No one ever took it but came, sometimes very soon, to wish he hadn't. Peter took it when he denied Christ by the fire in the High Priest's courtyard; and in a little Peter was weeping bitterly. Cranmer took it when he recanted. He found safety, but he didn't find peace, and soon we see him holding the hand that signed his recantation in the fire till it shrivelled away. The pain of that was nothing to the pain of a shamed conscience.

Take the hard way always. It is a man's way. It may bring pain; but pain will pass and shame won't. No one may know but you and God when you play the coward, but that is just two too many.

It is better to be hurt in the body than ashamed in your own soul. It is manly to bear pain, but shame takes away your manhood.

It may seem a little thing that nobody sees, but it is a far bigger thing than you think. Every time a boy or girl refuses the easy way out and takes the hard way, whatever the consequences may be, something is added to the world's golden store of heroism and high faithfulness. They have written their names in the Roll of Honour of those who 'were tortured, not accepting deliverance,' that Roll at the head of which stands the glorious name of Jesus Christ.

#### Anticipatory Footwork.

By THE REVEREND J. OPIE URMSON, SOUTH SHIELDS.

'Having shod your feet with preparation.'—Eph 6<sup>15</sup>.

There is no better advice for life than the motto which the Boy Scouts and the Girl Guides carry on their banners, and which Paul here gives to the Christian soldier: 'Be Prepared.'

It is impossible to read St. Paul's Epistles without thinking, not only that he liked games, but that he knew how to excel in them. He would not have referred to them so often had he not been interested in them; and he would not have been so accurate had he been merely a spectator. When he is advising the Christian warrior about getting ready for the fray, before he mentions sword, shield, or helmet, he tells him to tighten his belt and look to his feet. That is very sound advice, for the feet are all-important. We play almost every game with our feet. Football, cricket, tennis, fencing, are all played with our feet. If you think otherwise, that is probably why you do not play well. Everything depends upon anticipatory footwork; upon the feet being shod with preparation.

Watch the expert goalkeeper. The opposing forward gathers the ball, and shoots it into one corner of the goal. Like a flash the goalkeeper is there awaiting it. How did he get there? Some instinct warned him; and half a second before it came he anticipated it, and he was prepared. You have seen the batsman drive the ball, and you have cheered excitedly. You feel sure that it will be a boundary. Then you notice a fielder who seems to spring from nowhere, and there is a counter cheer as he brings off a magnificent running catch. How did he do it? His feet were shod with preparation. He had anticipated the stroke. When two men are fencing, they seek to play each other as an angler plays a fish. They tempt each



other to make a mistake in footwork. When that comes they strike, and strike at once.

When I was a boy I was told to count ten before I spoke a hasty word. It was poor counsel. When the blood is hot there is no thought of counting. Paul knew that in temptation, as in games, there is no time for thinking. As my fencing master in the old army used to say, 'Until you can fence without thinking you cannot fence at all. The attack calls out the defence.' Just as the eye shields itself when harm threatens, so the trained conscience recoils when sin attacks.

*Religion is a means not of getting us off punishment, but of teaching us how to avoid mistakes.* One of the glories of Jesus was that, though His enemies were always seeking to trap Him, He was always prepared. People commonly forget this. They ask, 'What would Jesus have done had He been in the circumstances in which I am involved?' The answer is that He would not have been there. Once upon a time I had a friend staying with me who was a chess expert. Every night we played chess. Every game he won. One night, however, I thought I was doing better. But I soon realized that I was losing again. So I turned the board round and said, 'What would you do if you were in my place?' 'Well,' he said, 'you cannot win.' Then he explained how, about twelve moves earlier, I had fallen into a trap which he had set. I was defeated before I knew it. So also life is a number of actions all depending upon one another. To-day's thoughts become to-morrow's desires. Desires become actions, and actions grow into habits. If you would live a pure life you must learn to think only pure thoughts. Religion does not promise that anyone can come out of difficulty with flying colours. Everything depends upon preliminary footwork.

*Anticipation, both in life and in games, depends upon trained judgment.* You cannot learn the art either of cricket or of life from books. You can, of course, get many hints and helps in that way, but you must go out and practise. Do not think too much about the hard knocks that you receive. Do not get discouraged because you cannot do just what you try to do. Keep on trying, and always try your utmost. Do not grow careless, for during these fits of carelessness bad habits are formed. Learn from your failures, and do not get caught the same way a second time. Bit by bit the hardest tasks grow easier, and the judgment becomes more trustworthy. You remember Paul's words: 'Herein I exercise myself to have a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man.'

Yet when you have taken care you sometimes fail. What then? Own up! Do not try to prove that you are not out. If you own up there is always another chance. That is what the gospel means. 'If we confess our sins he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' That is, God will give us another start with a clean sheet. But be ready; and ask God's guidance. 'He will keep the feet of his saints, for by strength shall no man prevail.'

## The Christian Year.

### THE EPIPHANY.

#### The Faith of God.

'Thy walls are continually before me.'—Is 49<sup>16</sup>.

These words admit us to the very heart of God. It is indeed when we consider deeply words of this kind that we perceive how Jesus Christ must have been in the Godhead from all eternity. 'God is love,' said St. John, after he had seen Christ on Calvary. 'Love is an agony'—*Caritas est passio*—an agony of yearning and defeat and faith, said Origen of Alexandria. But Isaiah had the first word and anticipated them all: 'Where men see only ruins,' said he, 'God sees the finished walls.'

The words were spoken to the captive Jews in Babylon at a momentous stage in their history. Cyrus, King of Elam, had come up against Babylon with a mighty army and had occupied the great city without opposition. And, doubtless for his own reasons, and thinking nothing at all of how in doing as he did he was furthering God's purposes, Cyrus issued a decree permitting the captives of every nation who had been detained in Babylon to return to their several countries.

Nothing, therefore, stood in the way of the Jews going back to their native land. And yet, when all things were ready, they hung back. There is nothing more disheartening to men who wish to think greatly of man than to consider the miserable number of captive Jews who showed any real passion for their ancient liberty and standing. As for the great mass of these captives, they simply did not want to hear anything more about the holy city and those great days of which their fathers had told them. 'I hate luxury,' said Goethe; 'it destroys the imagination.' Fifty years of life in Babylon had carried those people a long way from their old moorings,

Some of them found themselves unable to believe that it was now really possible for them to go back,

to believe that they were now really free. Some of them were afraid (at least so they professed) of the return journey, afraid of the desert with its wild beasts, with its roving bands of robbers, with its hunger and thirst. At least they gave that as their reason for staying where they were, although we may have our doubts.

If we go on living in a trifling way, never taking ourselves seriously or looking the whole of this life of ours in the face ; if we go on day after day avoiding all contact with the ultimate meaning of things, whether that be to us meanwhile a voice or a silence ; the real penalty for such a way of living is the consequence of it, and that is, that we get to like it, we become unfit for anything better or different. Perhaps, therefore, the most difficult spiritual condition for any of us to fall into is that condition which comes with years and years of elaborate trifling, of busy superficiality, when we have at length lost all taste and desire for anything serious and real, all sense of that severity in things, that terror even, which, in the case of most of us, ought for good reasons to be there until it has been dealt with and honourably composed.

There were still others of the captive Jews who, though the way was clear, did not at first set out. When the prophet appealed to them to return, they replied in effect : 'Return ? Return to what ? To dust and ashes ? What's the use now ? Jerusalem is a desolation, a heap of dust and ruins !' It was to these that the prophet flung back the words which really give us God Himself—'Thy walls are continually before me !'

There was something to be said for the view taken by these last. There is always a great deal to be said for the disheartening view of any holy enterprise : only we should not say it—unless, of course, to God in prayer. The thing that makes faith faith is that it has to stand up to a great deal of difficulty. Why, faith is just the protest of something glorious and unconquerable in the soul of man against the domination of what the world calls facts. Faith, too, has its facts which it asserts are as truly there as the facts which strike our mere sense. Faith takes its really unassailable stand upon the supreme fact—the fact of God ! Now that is the whole point of this text : it is the whole point of the Book of Isaiah ; it is the point of the whole Bible, and of Jesus Christ, and of the true Church of God in the world. There is an immense gulf between men—there are those who begin with God, and there are the others.

Those reluctant Jews who hung back from an enterprise of faith because of the difficulties by

the way, those people who said, 'Jerusalem is now in ruins,' were forgetting that the real situation is not what we see upon the surface, but what God sees, and what He in holy and prophetic moments reveals to us in measure. The real fact about any situation or about a human soul is—what lies within it for God, what it is worth to God. And this is the work of God—to make us believe, to make us see things and see ourselves and one another as He in His infinite hopefulness sees us all. Where we see ruins, He sees the walls.

What if God were to become discouraged over us, as well He might ? What if He were to turn His back upon us and let us alone ? Ah, well : He does not. Now that Christ is of us, He will not. He lives by faith—yes, by faith in the Son of God who gave Himself for us all. He sees something coming. He sees man, the prodigal son, coming back and home.

In the great charity of God we are not simply what we are in our mere performances. We are also what we are in our lonely protests—in our tears and agonies and cries. We are not merely what we are in our feelings about ourselves ; still less are we altogether what we may have given the world cause to consider us. We are really, what we are to those who love us. We are really what we are to that holy and loving God whose face man saw for one tremendous moment in the Christ of history. Let us, therefore, go on to believe, and let us act as though we did believe, that in that same great charity of God we may through Christ's eternal intercession even yet recover the lost provinces of our souls, may yet become, both now and through the ages, all that God saw in us as possible, all that He dreamed of us when He decreed us being, and set us our task in the world of spirits.

In conclusion let us say :

1. We are to imitate the faith of God. We, also, are to see 'the walls'—God's completed purposes—ever before us. Everybody sees the ruins. It needs no great qualification to see difficulties. It is the mark of God's calling to see 'the walls.' We have nothing to do with times and seasons or with events ; we have only to do with duties.

2. We cannot see 'the walls' : let it be enough that God sees them, that Christ saw them. For ourselves, the proof that the walls are coming is that He has given us the instinct to build.

3. This vision is ours when our hearts are pure. There is an old legend of the Middle Ages of a pilgrim who, as he passed through dark and silent



forests, saw before him a great cathedral, even heard the solemn and happy music of it. But as often as his own heart became confused with doubt or lost its beautiful balance through the disturbance of some private sin, the vision perished, the music ceased, leaving him in the pathless forest, surrounded by the ancient darkness and natural despair. So the pure in heart see God. But let us begin to build if we would be sure of 'the walls.' In every matter into which God comes, those who merely look on see nothing.

And, above everything, let us keep in touch with the Master; in communion with that great Soul of faith and hope and love; in communion with that atmosphere of miracle and triumph which caught into a kind of glory the first apostles. For what man once saw, he may still see. The power of that vision is still there, still somewhere, if we will only seek it with our undivided will, with our undistracted confidence.<sup>1</sup>

#### FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

##### A Pagan's Pathway to Faith.

'Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'—Mt 8<sup>10</sup>.

This is a very touching and a very illuminating story. Often Christ had to awaken faith before He could heal. Here He found a great faith waiting for Him. It is worth noting that He commended this man's faith, and that for the one reason for which faith is valuable, that it created the atmosphere in which He could work.

1. The question that naturally interests us is how this man came to have this faith. He was a Roman soldier, a pagan, an alien, and, therefore, one who was not likely to see in a Jewish peasant a world-transforming power. It would be very difficult for him, with such traditions and training as his, to appreciate Jesus; but is it not rather a startling thing that those who in His own day seemed to appreciate Jesus best were those who stood outside the religious world of Palestine—the heathen, the outcast, the prodigal? There are signs of this even in our own day. It is very interesting, very searching, to realize that some of those outside the churches have a feeling about Jesus which reaches nearer to worship than that of some of the people within. Mr. H. G. Wells sums up his picture of Him by the confession that 'He is too great for our small hearts,' and Mr. Middleton-Murry in his *Life of Jesus* comes to this conclusion: 'Keep we our heads as high as we

can, they shall be bowed at the last.' But there is a kind of worship of Him which has the effect of putting Him on a pedestal from which He cannot reach us, and is really a way of escape from His demand. This man had no theological ideas about Jesus. His faith was natural and simple. How did he come to have it? There is no question more worth asking, for, unless the New Testament is a fairy-tale, this faith in Christ is the one thing the lack of which, for many people, is making the world a place of failure and strife and misery. How came this pagan to see in Christ a love which he could trust in perfect confidence?

The secret is to be found in the man's attitude to all those among whom he lived. He could see the good in all sorts of people—Jew and Gentile, rich and poor. He was a worshipper of heathen gods; yet he could see what was good in the Jews with their vastly different faith. He was a Roman; yet he could appreciate fine qualities in people of another race. He was an officer of the army of occupation in Palestine, and yet he had no feeling of superiority to a subject people. He was a man of rank; yet he had made a friend of his servant and felt for him so strong an affection that the man's sickness brought genuine pain. In short, this centurion had come to a real sense of the value of men as men.

Now, that is a very wonderful thing. It prompts us to ask ourselves how far we have found our way into this world of real human values, and are living in it. It is what Jesus meant by love, this moral valuation of personality. We have only to look below the surface to find how much our social and industrial trouble is due to the fact that our sense of human values has been, in one way or the other, obscured. There are many things that obscure it. A hundred years ago, children were set to work in mines and factories, because their human value was obscured by what was thought to be economic necessity. The real root of war is the fact that this human value is hidden for the moment by what is felt to be the duty of patriotism.

2. What has all this to do with the centurion's faith in Christ? If we think for a moment what faith is, we shall understand. Faith is our response to what we see in Jesus. It is an impulse of trust which is awakened by our vision of that in Him which meets our need. Faith cannot function at all, except through the vision of Jesus bursting into our hearts to quicken wonder and love. And many people cannot see Jesus in His reality because their minds are bound by prejudice of one kind or another. But this man had

<sup>1</sup> J. A. Hutton, *At Close Quarters*, 212.

a free and unprejudiced mind. He did not need, for instance, to get over the fact that Jesus was a Jew and a peasant. He had got over that kind of prejudice which, in some people, made it intolerable for them during the war to sing a hymn by a German author, though written perhaps some four hundred years ago; which in others makes it difficult to see in a man like Gandhi—just because they dislike his politics—one in some ways more nearly Christian than many of us. This centurion was free from all those mists that cloud the judgment and blind our eyes, and when he met with Christ he found in Him the incarnation of what he really valued—the goodness and love by which he had unconsciously striven to live.

But there was more. This man had realized in his own life the power of this attitude to others. What joy it had brought into his own life! What friendships it had given him with all sorts of people! And what difficult problems it had helped him to solve! And, as he stood before Jesus, it flashed upon him that here was One who was Master in that field of love; here was One who had at His disposal all its resources and wielded to the full the only power which could penetrate men's hearts and start the springs of new life there. It may be that he realized an even deeper thing—that here, in Christ, was the source of that spirit that had been moving in his own life and had made him what he was. In any case, his whole soul fell captive to the personality of Jesus. 'Speak the word only,' he said, 'and my servant shall be healed,' and through that faith the love of Christ was set free.

3. Now, what does this suggest to us? Does it not suggest this, for one thing, that the value we have for Jesus is bound up with the value we have for other people? To put it quite clearly, people who do not love others, whatever their rank or race, do not really love Christ in the true sense of the word. They are living in an artificial world. If they really examined themselves, they would discover that, beneath all false respect for people, what they really love is money, or rank, or whatever else ministers to their own pride.

What is more, we have no real faith in Christ, save as our faith is in that love of His which values every one, the prodigal and the saint, the rich and the poor, and we see in that love the only real power in the world. For true faith in Christ is the conviction that His love is power. And the only way in which He can save the world is through this same love, brought into action by our faith in it. Was not His whole effort in the world the

effort to persuade men and women to become one human family, and to see each other and deal with each other as we see and deal with our own brothers and sisters? The root idea of the Kingdom of God is a world become one family.

4. But the question is, how to reach this attitude. The first step is to revise our values of people. It is to determine to see the best in others, to believe in it, to trust it, and to make adventures of friendship. How often do we give others credit for the same ideals as are in ourselves—especially if they do not belong to our circle—and insist on meeting them on that basis? Before Ezekiel the prophet opened his mouth to tell the exiles in Babylon what he thought about them, he was bidden to go and sit where they sat. For ten days or so he lived with them, and when he began to speak, there was a tenderer note in his voice. The beginning of a new outlook is to see in other lives a value that is, at least, as great as that in our own. Most of all, it is to see in Christ a love which is not in ourselves, and to open our hearts to it, praying that He will deepen this love in us, which is the entering in of His own spirit.

It may be that all we are capable of, to begin with, is a confession and a longing, in which there is only a spark of hope.

I am unjust, but I can strive for justice.

My life's unkind, but I can vote for kindness.

I, the unlovely, say life should be lovely.

I that am blind, cry out against my blindness.

It may be that, like the centurion, the awakened love for other people, as we see them in their bitter need and helplessness, will throw us open to the love that can alone heal ourselves, and bring healing to the world. It is not seldom that he who has not felt the need of Christ for himself, has come to feel it through the aching need to help another. And, bit by bit, the faith in Him will grow through which miraculous things will begin to happen, and, for us and others, a new day will begin to dawn.<sup>1</sup>

#### SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

##### Towering o'er the Wrecks of Time.

'Our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father.'—Gal 1<sup>st</sup>.

There is a sublime and suggestive passage in St. Paul where he defines the Christian redemption

<sup>1</sup> J. Reid, *In Touch with Christ*, 38.



in terms of deliverance from the tyranny of the evanescent. 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world.' It sounds almost as if the Apostle were wrestling with something which is very familiar to modern men under the title of the *Zeitgeist*, the time-spirit.

1. The dominion of the time-spirit is a real thing in any and every stage of human progress. Lord Morley has called it a great historical principle, that 'besides the prominent men of a generation there is something at work beneath, a moving current on whose flood they are borne.' And if the prominent find it hard to get out of the current of their own age and steer an independent course, the pull upon smaller souls is proportionately mightier. Yet if the emancipation of a human soul is to be complete, it must include deliverance from this tyranny: it may even have to consist chiefly in this. Evil takes different forms in different ages: men are poorly equipped for their conflict if they have learned to wrestle merely with dead heresies and forgotten sins. Matthew Arnold, who did so much to familiarize in this country the idea of the *Zeitgeist*, has an ironic passage in which he compares the *Times* newspaper of his day to 'a gigantic Sancho Panza,' 'following by an attraction he cannot resist that poor, mad, scorned, suffering, sublime enthusiast, the modern spirit; following it, indeed, with constant grumbling, expostulation, and opposition, with airs of protection, of compassionate superiority, with an incessant by-play of nods, shrugs, and winks addressed to the spectators; following it, in short, with all the incurable recalcitrancy of a lower nature, but still following it.'

If a great newspaper sometimes does this, much more is a humble individual likely to do it, perhaps grumbling at his age, criticising it, complaining against it, yet on the whole doing what it wants him to do. It is one of the perplexities of history that the grip of the age even upon the more enlightened individual has often been so strong. The tales of lust and blood which disfigure the lives even of some of the heroes of Old Testament story are best accounted for by the spirit of the age.

2. It goes without saying that much of the influence of the time-spirit is not only inevitable but beneficial. Good as well as evil has different developments in different ages, but He who is not the God of the dead but of the living would have His people alive to all His present leadings. One half of a man's duty towards his own age is to reverence it, understand it, and serve it. But the

other half is not to be enslaved or blinded by it. There could be no finer example than the character and work of the great apostle himself. He was a man of his own age, a Jew of the Jews, a citizen of the Roman Empire, a typical product of a particular race and religion at a certain time. Yet he would have made small mark upon history had there not been another side to him altogether—his fine independence of his age. He had this power from Christ. In the fellowship of Christ he found this liberty. In the words of Principal Forsyth, 'a positive, eternal creative gospel for the spiritual conscience is what we need—not a set of true beliefs to contend with false, but the holy, living God of historic grace to keep us from the idols of the religious mind and the passing age.'

3. It is easier, perhaps, to state this in general than to apply it to the circumstances of a special age such as our own—an age is difficult to sum up. R. H. Hutton points out that the usual course of the *Zeitgeist* is like that of Mephistopheles—zigzag. 'It breathes on us, and we can no longer see a course which was clear yesterday. It breathes again, and, like invisible ink held to the fire, the truth comes out again in all its brightness.'

Some observers of our age might tell us of its frivolity. Other observers, perhaps equally truthful, might tell our generation about its gloom, the cynicism and pessimism even of some of our young people who, running everywhere in quest of joy, have not found it. As true a diagnosis as any might define our age as being, in and beneath these things, an age of egotism—an egotism now feverish in its thirst for pleasure, now morbid in its wounded pride, yet ever thrusting and pushing, breaking all the commandments because heedless on the one hand of a neighbour's welfare as on the other of the Divine will. It is not a comfortable age to live in. There is written all over its restless life that men need deliverance from some of its most characteristic qualities. They need deliverance from themselves.

They are meant to find it. That is the very meaning of revelation. Revelation lay in this, the coming of the Eternal into the midst of time, revealing the timeless truth and love, and supplying a pattern which time could not antiquate and a motive which time could not exhaust. This is the meaning of Jesus Christ, 'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever,' and of His Cross, which, erected but for the business of a cruel day, is still 'towering o'er the wrecks of time,' the supreme sign of God, the supreme hope of the world. It is this that is needed to correct the frivolity of our

age and to teach it seriousness and sincerity. It is this that is no less needed to correct its glooms, and to bring into place of its cynicism and pessimism the peace and hope of redemption. It is this that alone can conquer the egotism of our time-spirit, and teach a thrusting and selfish world the law which is perfect liberty. So the Lord Christ reigns over every age, the Master of them all.<sup>1</sup>

#### SEPTUAGESIMA.

##### The Epic of Redemption.

'And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.'—Gn 1<sup>st</sup>.

That is the first assertion of religious faith and it is the last. And it is, too, the everlasting changeless background on which the confused and shifting pageant of faith's agelong struggle is flung. The history of human faith is the history of the long warfare which this certainty has had to wage for its very existence. The certainty was there in the beginning, as it will be in the end. Religion cannot exist without it. And there is no surer proof that man is naturally religious than his obstinate certainty that, if the whole of things could be seen at once and as a whole, it would be recognized as very good.

Take any history of long-continued religious experience, and see how it bears witness to the truth of this fact. Take, for instance, the Bible. It begins with an act of faith in the goodness of the whole. It gathers up the agelong process of Divine creation, that process which is coterminous with the existence of things in time, into one single moment, regards it in a single flash as with the eye of God, and from that standpoint pronounces it without hesitation very good. The fundamental characteristic of every act of man's faith in God is just that impossible and yet for man indispensable attempt to see things as God sees them. It was probably that particular urgency and necessity of faith which Tertullian was trying to express when he uttered his famous *Credo quia impossibile*, 'I believe in the impossible just because it is impossible.'

But hardly has this act of faith been made, this certainty proclaimed, by the Jewish race, by Tertullian, or by any of the rest of us, before we are compelled to bring it down to the test of our actual experience. And there it meets with nothing but rebuke. Things are most obviously not very good. The more close, indeed, the hold of God,

the worse things as they are seem to us to be. That is the experience which the Bible records in the mythical story of the Fall.

It is only the account which a stern religious realism is forced to give of what man actually is and of what the world necessarily seems to him, being what he is, to be. Yet, in apparently hopeless disillusionment, he realizes a Divine assurance that he will one day crush the head of that evil which so ruthlessly pursues him, biting viciously at his flying heel. And on throughout the whole history the same certainty revives out of the darkest hours of apparent defeat and felt despair. In Abraham, in Moses, in Elijah, in Isaiah, in the long succession of the prophets, the terrible conflict of faith is renewed, and the certainty is always recovered out of the very experiences that seem to extinguish it utterly. And the long history of faith, which the Bible is, closes as it began with the proclamation of the great religious certainty as near to its final accomplishment.

So it is that the Bible is for the religious sense one book. It ends on the note with which it opened. That first chapter is but the attempt to express from the standpoint of eternity a process which is still going forward, which will continue so long as man endures. The rest of the book is the history of creation under the aspect of time, the history of that redemptive activity of God which is for us His real continuous creation of His world. It was all stated in a phrase by our Lord, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.'

Now what we want specially to emphasize, on Septuagesima Sunday, which is as it were the annual festival of God as Creator, is that redemption is the key to the religious idea of creation, that the revelation of God in Jesus Christ is the secret of all our knowledge of God whatsoever. This does not mean that if our Lord had not lived as a man upon earth, man would not have known God. Such a view would be an insane denial of fact. God not only was known, and known with a wonderful spiritual intimacy, by the great seers of Israel before our Lord's coming, but He is known to-day by multitudes who have never heard the name of Jesus.

But think of the vanity of any attempt to find God in the world apart from this illuminating power which the redemptive stress of the Divine Spirit can awake in the souls of men. The non-human world is now the supreme difficulty with which faith in God has to grapple. The order which we find there seems utterly careless of human life. It will cut off in their prime the lives that seem to us

<sup>1</sup> J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 224.



of most promise and value. It will let the worthless linger on in untroubled uselessness to their fellows to the furthest term of our human span. It will torture the brave, the patient, the unselfish with lingering and malignant disease.

And yet because of all this is faith in God less sure? The Book of Job belongs to a past when the full measure of Nature's moral indifference was not suspected, and yet it witnesses to a faith which had conquered the worst that the apparent hostility of circumstance could accomplish. For faith issues from a purely human experience. Think of what that experience is. It is a profound and insatiable discontent with self. It is the discovery that this is not our spirit's home. And yet when our self-discontent is most profound, just then the great consolation arrives. A heavenly peace broods upon the troubled conflict, the soul knows its rest in the very fact of its onward struggle. That is the spiritual history of man. It is the history of man's discovery of God as the human redeemer, as the redeemer of man by man. It is the history of God's revelation of Himself to man as the Power which constitutes him, and constitutes him as at once the theatre and the conscious instrument of this conflict in which dwells the supreme peace, of this truceless dissatisfaction with himself at the heart of which resides the infinite satisfaction of a Presence higher than himself.

And out of this experience of the redemptive God there grows naturally, inevitably, the faith in the creative God, the faith that somehow the whole of things must serve the purpose of that redeeming will, the faith that the most inexplicable waywardness of Nature not only does not contradict that purpose, but must somehow, even though we may never see how, contribute to it, the faith that through all things that are there works a spirit of very goodness. It is a sheer act of faith, but it is an act of faith which the immediate experience of the redeeming God has always forced man to make and which only that experience enables him to make.<sup>1</sup>

#### SEXAGESIMA

##### The Flying Roll and the Flying Angel.

'Then I turned, and lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a flying roll.'—Zec 5<sup>1</sup>.

'And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven.'—Rev 14<sup>6</sup>.

There is no far-fetched straining needed to bring these two sentences together. Though they lie

<sup>1</sup> A. L. Lilley, *Nature and Supernature*, 33.

apart, and in their utterance are divided by the space of many centuries, if we take the one with the other, beneath the glowing imagery in which they are expressed we shall find that they embrace in a striking unity the broad and deep truth of God's revelation as that is brought to bear upon the life and destiny of man. The flying roll: the flying angel; in the one you see the spirit of the Old Testament, in the other the spirit of the New. That is the reign of Nature, this is the reign of grace: there is the law, here is the gospel: there is the justice, here is the mercy of Almighty God.

1. 'Then I looked, and lifted up mine eyes, and behold a flying roll.' Is this merely the nightmare dream of a Hebrew prophet? Or, is it not rather a vision which carries us irresistibly beyond its immediate purpose to its eternal truth, which holds up before a man in a light terrific by its clearness that law which of all laws that rule human conduct is the most sweeping and indubitable; that law which tells us that behind every soul of man who has sinned there is a dark shadow deepening as the days pass by, which to the prophet's eyes appeared as a flying roll—a roll whose volume grows as it moves on, enclosing within its ever-increasing folds all the records of our past life.

Let us not forget, however, that this is a principle which may work for good as well as for ill. Most assuredly it is no one-sided law. Consider its influence on the positive side. Let a man do good. Let him obey the voice of God. Let him bow his will before the Eternal, and the very stars in their courses will fight for him; the majesty of heaven will follow in his train, and all the bright days he has lived, and all the moral victories he has won, will shed their light upon his path.

But let a man do evil. Let him spurn the voice of God. Let him set his will above the Eternal, and by all the force of God's universe he will be pursued and overwhelmed. Tell us not of the success of wicked men. Will we measure success by the idle standards of the world, will we weigh the soul which is immortal in the false balances of earth? God forbid. The good man alone is successful, the bad man eternally a failure.

Our deeds still travel with us from afar,  
And what we have been makes us what we are.

Everything we do or think or say, every form of our activity, has a certain moulding power over the soul, and thus in the lives of most men we find a certain consistency. What would be the condition of human life if it were otherwise, if our state at any one moment were entirely separated from all that

had gone before? How heavily weighted man would be in the struggle which his life is! At every fresh encounter he would have to give up the vantage ground so dearly won, and so begin the fight anew.

If we search through all the great literatures, the Bibles of the human race, we shall find that the most penetrating and universal thought which has impressed itself upon the mind of man is that ancient doctrine, ever new, of the Nemesis that follows still the guilty choice. 'Keeping watch over the universe and letting no offence go unpunished'—that doctrine which has ingrained itself in the common language of men—an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, measure for measure—that truth which, whether it comes to us in the imagery of Eastern mythology, or in the burning words of Greek dramatist, or in the quivering accents of ancient prophecy, is the truth which underlay this vision, the flying roll which follows in the track of sin, the presence undefined which cannot be put by.

Our acts our angels are for good or ill,  
Our fatal shadows that walk by us still.

2. Turn now from this dark vision. Let us listen to the voice of the New Testament as it also rings through the ages and finds a joyful echo in the soul of man:

'And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.'

From the lofty watch tower the angel can see the ravages which sin has made over the souls beneath. And as he bears his message to those souls the power and the grace of God are visible there. For wherever he is heard, wherever a soul in the loneliness of its sin bows itself before the offer of grace, the dark record is erased, and the guilty past effaced, and the flying roll cast off, and the soul which was literally dead in trespasses and sins is reconciled to God and breathes a purer and serener air. That terrible

chain which bound the soul to sin and death is snapped by the power of God in Christ.

Nay, more; even as the power of the flying roll was so subtle and so far-reaching that it threw its baneful influence over every soul of man, even so does the message of the flying angel, the grace of God, come to every soul. As there is no one who can utterly escape the dreadful curse of sin, so need there be no one to whom the grace shall be denied. It is, as we see, the characteristic of all God's truth that it is two-edged, and the very same law which leads from sin to deeper sin, leads also from holiness to higher holiness. Let a man but turn towards the light. Let him freely obey the Infinite Will. Let him look on the Cross. Let him bow before that supreme offering made by Supreme Love because the need of man was great. Looking on that spectacle we see into the very depths of God's heart; we see more, much more, than the terror of God's avenging justice, we see the infinity of His love. When with open face we behold that vision, then goes forth the soul to God. This is something more than an intellectual appreciation of the meaning of Christ's suffering and death. It is, so to speak, to make them spiritually tangible to our own souls. It is to realize that this love is our possession, and, realizing this, the soul goes forth to possess Christ and is emptied of self.

Surely there is no man to whom this assurance of a living Saviour should not bring joy. We live in a world of changes. We have a past behind us which is darkened by a record of sin. We have a future before us which is also dark and uncertain. The shadows of time gather fast. Amid the increasing round of daily duties, amid the hard commonplaces of the world's battle, we are hurried on and ever on. There is for us a joy in human friendship, but it is fleeting and fickle at the best. There is a noble pleasure in the sternness of daily toil, but the night cometh when no man can work. What shall be our stay in this shifting scene—who will take us by the hand and lead us through the darkness to the brighter day? There is only one stay on which to rest, and that is true religion; there is only one who can efface the guilty record of the past and give us new life, and that is Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. W. Williamson, *The Glorious Gospel*, 140.



## The Resurrection Morning.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. LIMMER SHEPPARD, D.D., RECTOR OF MYLAND, COLCHESTER.

### I.

#### THE PROBLEM.

THE four narratives of the Resurrection Morning, as given by the Four Evangelists, present, to a cursory glance, very much the same outline of events. They tell us of certain women visiting the place of our Lord's burial at an early hour, of their finding the stone removed from the Tomb and the Body disappeared, and of their receiving angelic messages announcing that Christ had risen from the dead.

But when these four narratives are examined in detail, a multitude of apparent discrepancies become manifest. It will be best to set out these discrepancies at length, in order the better to appreciate their difficulty. They may be summed up under four heads :

1. *The Women who visited the Tomb.*—Each Evangelist mentions names which, although in some instances coincident, yet differ from each other as a whole :

- (a) St. John mentions Mary Magdalene alone.
- (b) St. Matthew speaks of Mary Magdalene and 'the other Mary'; the latter, from Mt 27<sup>56</sup>, obviously being 'Mary the mother of James and Josés.'
- (c) St. Mark mentions both Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, but adds Salome (this last, by comparing Mt 27<sup>56</sup> with Mk 15<sup>40</sup>, is seen to be 'the mother of Zebedee's children').
- (d) St. Luke gives the names of Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, but adds the name of Joanna, and speaks of 'other women with them.'

It will therefore be seen that no one mention of names corresponds accurately with another.

2. *The Time of the Visit.*—Here we have three differing statements :

- (a) St. John says that the visit took place 'while it was yet dark.'
- (b) St. Matthew says that it occurred 'as it began to dawn,' which is nearly coincident with St. Luke's 'at early dawn.'

- (c) St. Mark places the visit as being 'when the sun was risen' (Mk 16<sup>2</sup> [R.V.]).

Thus there is a difference of at least an hour and probably of an hour and a half between the four narratives.

3. *The Vision of Angels.*—Here each account differs from the rest :

- (a) St. Matthew describes an angel descending from heaven, rolling away the stone, and sitting upon it, obviously outside the Tomb.
- (b) St. Mark states that the women saw a young man in white, already sitting within the Tomb and on the right side of it.
- (c) St. Luke relates that *after* the women had entered the Tomb, two men 'in dazzling apparel' appeared standing beside them.
- (d) St. John says that after St. Peter and St. John had found the Tomb empty and departed, Mary Magdalene saw two angels in white sitting, within the Tomb, at each end of the rocky ledge on which the Body of Christ had been placed.

Thus the number and the position of these angelic messengers show wide variation. It should also be noted that while the angelic message to the women, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, is practically one and the same, those which are given by the other two Evangelists are widely different from that and also from each other.

#### 4. *The Action of the Women.*

##### (A) Before the Resurrection.

- (a) St. Luke tells us that the women, *before* the Sabbath day, *prepared* spices and ointments (which apparently they already possessed).
- (b) St. Mark tells us that the women only *bought* the spices *after* the Sabbath was over (so that evidently they did not possess any beforehand).

##### (B) After the Resurrection.

- (a) St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John

agree that information was given by the women to the Apostles.

(b) St. Mark declares that the women told no one.

Perplexing and even amazing as these many discrepancies appear when thus set out in detail, it must be borne in mind that the fact of our blessed Lord's resurrection from the dead is quite independent of them. If there were no accounts of these events of the Resurrection Morning, or if they all had to be dismissed as contradictory and therefore untrustworthy, His many appearances to His disciples furnish indubitable proof of His living again. Nor is it the object of these four narratives of that First Easter Morning to show that Christ was alive, so much as to prove beyond dispute that the actual Body, which had been nailed to and taken down from the Cross, was now raised from the dead. Hence, in the four narratives, special attention is drawn to the actual spot where the Body was laid, to the grave-cloths in which it was enfolded, and which were still occupying that spot, as well as to the entire disappearance of the Body itself from the Tomb. The Living Christ Himself would be seen afterwards in Galilee, as announced to the women by the angel.

## II.

### THE KEY TO THE PROBLEM.

The problem of the four narratives of the Resurrection may be dealt with in four different ways.

(1) The existence of the discrepancies in the narratives may be denied, or they may be entirely ignored; either method can scarcely commend itself to any honest reader, inasmuch as the discrepancies undoubtedly do exist, while to ignore them is simply the refusal to face facts.

(2) It may be frankly declared that the discrepancies are, from our point of view, irreconcilable, although, did we possess the complete facts of the Resurrection story, their harmony would be clear; this, of course, can neither be proved nor denied, and practically leaves the Problem untouched.

(3) The discrepancies may be fully admitted, and accounted for in three directions: partly by the deliberate alterations in the narratives made by the various writers, so that, *e.g.*, St. Matthew may be supposed to have confused two visions of angels, and altered St. Mark's record accordingly; partly by lapses of memory, so that, *e.g.*, St. John, in his old age, had forgotten the exact order and nature of the events at the Tomb; and partly by the

vivid imagination of the women, so that Joanna and Salome flee from the Tomb, their brains filled with impressions of angels and voices, while Mary Magdalene runs away from sheer panic. This method will seem to many extremely unsatisfactory,<sup>1</sup> and irreconcilable with such definite promises of Christ as those of Jn 14<sup>26</sup> and 16<sup>13</sup>.

(4) The fourth method consists in attempting to harmonize the four narratives as they stand; this has been tried again and again, and with such ill success that, in the view of many, the method itself has become discredited.

Yet there seems to be a perfectly reasonable explanation, which does undoubtedly dispel many of the difficulties already mentioned, even if, in one or two details, some uncertainty may remain. The reason for the failure of the attempts to harmonize the four narratives seems to lie in the fixed idea that these narratives are identical in their scope and refer to one and the same series of events; harmony on this line undoubtedly is impossible. But it would seem to be quite obvious that if four perfectly reliable witnesses describe women visiting one particular spot, arriving at different times, seeing different persons, and hearing different addresses, the explanation must lie in the women paying their visits in four different parties. If we assume, as almost every one does, that the four narratives are all records of a visit by the same people, the confusion is indeed inexplicable. But if we once grasp the idea of four different visits to the Tomb by four sets of women, each evangelist narrating one and a different visit from the other three, but being cognizant of the other visits and even referring to them, then we have a real solution of apparent contradictions, the Key to the Problem lying in this fact of there being four parties of women who visited the Tomb on the Resurrection Morning.<sup>2</sup> A careful study of the four narratives, noting certain indications in the Greek, will show

<sup>1</sup> It is an interesting illustration of the loose use of terms by modern criticism, when such hypotheses as that St. Matthew's account was a fraudulent fabrication and St. John's that of a senile dotard (for which not a shred of positive evidence exists) are described as resulting from 'rigid and scientific research'!

<sup>2</sup> Apart from all indications in the narratives, which are dealt with later, the *a priori* probability of these separate visits should not be unnoticed. The position of the disciples of Jesus in Jerusalem at that time was one of grave peril and uncertainty. For a number of women to have proceeded to the Tomb in a body would have been an extremely hazardous action; such visits would certainly have been paid only by individuals, or by small groups who would escape public notice.



how feasible is this solution, and how well the key fits.

In tracing the four parties of women, we must begin by noting the two original parties present at Calvary, which are carefully distinguished from each other in the Greek. Their existence is most clearly indicated by St. Mark. He tells us (Mk 15<sup>40, 41</sup>) that a number of women 'stood beholding from afar,' and then proceeds to describe them. 'Among' them, he says (*i.e.* not *μετά*, 'with,' but *ἐν*, 'among but distinct from the rest'—not 'of them'), were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James (called henceforth, for convenience' sake, 'the other Mary'), and Salome; these three women, he says, were accustomed (as the Greek shows the meaning to be) to follow and to minister to Jesus when He was in Galilee. Then he mentions a second party of women, 'many others,' who came up with Jesus to Jerusalem, *i.e.* who ministered to Him on that last journey, as distinct from those just mentioned whose ministrations took place in Galilee itself.

St. Matthew makes the same distinction, though less clearly (Mt 27<sup>55f.</sup>), but adds the definite information (which St. Mark only implies) that those who were with Jesus on the last journey ministered to Him during that time—a period probably extending over several months.

St. Luke mentions only this latter party of women, who were with Jesus on the last journey (Lk 23<sup>49</sup>), which fact again makes the distinction clear between the two parties, and while he mentions later on (24<sup>10</sup>) the two Marys, he also mentions the name of Joanna, from which we may infer that, as she was obviously not connected with the three (the two Marys and Salome), she was the leader of these latter women whom St. Luke had just described, since we know that she had previously ministered to Jesus in His earlier Galilean ministry (Lk 8<sup>3</sup>).<sup>1</sup>

Thus, then, these two distinct parties of women are brought before our notice during the great tragedy on Calvary, and these presently resolve

<sup>1</sup> Joanna, as the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, must have been a wealthy woman, and, as the same verse tells us that for their ministrations the various women drew upon their own resources, it may well be that she alone was able to bear the great expense entailed in such ministration during the long journey to Jerusalem; so that, for this reason, the two Marys and Salome were unable to share therein, as they had done in Galilee, but journeyed separately to Jerusalem in order to meet Christ there on His arrival, Joanna taking with her on the journey the 'other women' of her party as her assistants.

themselves into the four parties of the Resurrection Morning, as we shall see when we trace their movements from the time they are presented to our view. It is noticeable that all three Evangelists reserve the mention of these women until the death of Jesus has taken place and the story of the Crucifixion is ended; thus indicating, in all probability, that the mention of them does not, as is generally supposed, point backward to Calvary, but forward to the burial, the account of which immediately follows, and so on to the Resurrection Morning.

### III.

#### THE MOVEMENTS OF THE WOMEN.

We have already seen that, although standing together, there were two distinct parties of women on Calvary, one consisting of the two Marys and Salome, and the other of Joanna and the women who accompanied her from Galilee. After some time, and apparently immediately before the three hours' darkness, the first movement of the women begins, as is clear from St. John's statement that, at that time, there stood by the Cross, Mary Magdalene, 'Mary the wife of Clopas' (or Alphæus, as Westcott points out, and so identical with 'the mother of James'), and the Virgin's sister, by which the Evangelist probably means Salome. Thus the first of the two parties of women have now separated themselves from the others, and approached the Cross, Joanna and her women evidently remaining as spectators at some little distance.

Tracing the movements of the first party only for the moment, we get our next glimpse of them at the burial. From the double mention of them (Mt 27<sup>61</sup> and Mk 15<sup>47</sup>) we find that, while the entombment was proceeding, the two Marys were seated, obviously at some distance, 'over against the sepulchre,' and were watching and marking (*ἐθεώρουν*) the place where their Lord was laid. It is at once noticeable that Salome is no longer with the two Marys, and the reason for her absence can only be conjectured. But as, immediately after St. John's account of them as standing at the Cross, he relates that, at the evident desire of his Lord, he led the Virgin Mary away from Calvary to his own home in the city, it is at least likely either (*a*) that the two Marys and Salome accompanied St. John and the Virgin, as their sympathy with her would naturally incline them to do, and that when the Apostle hurried back to Calvary, the two Marys followed him, leaving Salome to tend and comfort her sister, or (*b*) that Salome alone

accompanied St. John and the Virgin, leaving the two Marys on Calvary. The former hypothesis seems the more probable, because it accounts for the two Marys being at some little distance when the burial took place, which could easily happen if, on their return, they found the Body already being borne from the Cross. We find the three together again, after the Sabbath was past, buying spices in order to go to the Tomb and anoint the Body (Mk 16<sup>1</sup>).

Meanwhile the other party, with Joanna at their head, St. Luke tells us (23<sup>55</sup>), followed the Body 'close up to' the Tomb, as the preposition in the Greek verb shows, and not only so, but they closely scrutinized (ἐθεασάμετρο) the way in which the Body was laid in the Tomb; thus the first party could only see from the distance the *place* of burial, but the second party, who were quite close to the Tomb, examined the *method* of it. The significance of this distinction will appear later. Having thus seen exactly how the burial was carried out, these women return to their homes, and prepare spices and ointments (already in their possession apparently, as they are not said to have purchased them, for which, indeed, there was probably no time before the Sabbath began) so as to be in readiness for the anointing of the Body of their Lord when the Sabbath was over.

We now come to the records of the actual events of the Resurrection Morning. In these the important point is that, while the second of the two parties of women—that headed by Joanna—came to the Tomb together, as they had done on the Friday evening, the first party split up into three, and came separately to the Tomb, Mary Magdalene coming alone, but the other Mary and Salome, while coming independently of each other, each bringing certain other women with them. Thus we have four parties of women (counting Mary Magdalene as one) paying four separate visits to the Tomb in the early hours of the Resurrection Morning.

This fact, as already stated, is the Key to the Problem of the differences in the four records. We have now to see, in those records, the indications that these four parties came in this way.

There can be no reasonable doubt that, as recorded by St. John, Mary Magdalene came by herself, and also that she arrived first of all, 'while it was yet dark' (Jn 20<sup>1</sup>). 'Dark' must be a comparative expression, because as the Passover was regulated by the full moon, the sun would rise while the moon was still above the horizon, although low down; there may have been a dim

and uncertain light, but enough to enable Mary Magdalene to identify the stone lying apart from the Tomb, while still some little distance away. Her expression to the two Apostles, 'we know not where they have laid him,' is no proof that she was accompanied to the Tomb by any one else; the expression may be perfectly general, meaning that none of the company of the disciples knew the whereabouts of the Body, but more probably she uses the plural pronoun because she had intended to meet the other Mary and come to the Tomb with her, but had missed her and so came alone.

The next visit to the Tomb was that of the other Mary accompanied by some women, the visit recorded by St. Matthew, which probably took place while Mary Magdalene had run to tell her news to the two Apostles; it is quite conceivable that, if the two Marys had arranged to meet and missed each other, as suggested, the other Mary would go to the Tomb after a short time of waiting, or it may have been that the Tomb was the meeting-place, at which Mary Magdalene had first arrived. In our English version St. Matthew would seem to state that both Marys came together, but the Greek shows not only that he knew of Mary Magdalene coming alone, but that he records the two visits as being separate from each other. In English we use the one word 'came' for both singular and plural, but the Greek has two different forms; for two persons coming together it would read ἦλθον, for one alone ἦλθεν, and it is the latter and singular verb which is used here, although St. Matthew mentions the two names. The literal meaning of the Evangelist's word is, 'There came alone Mary Magdalene, and there came also the other Mary, to see the sepulchre.' Here, then, the Greek clearly indicates two distinct visits as taking place. Yet it is also certain that the other Mary did not come alone, inasmuch as the angel uses the plural 'ye' in speaking (Mt 28<sup>5</sup>), so that the other Mary must have brought others with her. There is, of course, an obvious difficulty involved in placing Mary Magdalene's visit first, because it is in this passage that there is recorded the rolling away of the stone, whereas Mary Magdalene had already seen it rolled away. But it is more than possible that Mt 28<sup>2-4</sup> is a parenthesis, inserted to explain both the presence of the angel and the open Tomb, and that the actual rolling away occurred before any visits took place at all, while v.<sup>6</sup> seems to show that the angel, having rolled the stone away, and sat upon it for awhile, then took his place within the Tomb itself, and therefore was not seen by Mary Magdalene. It is



also probable that the guards recovered their senses and fled before this second party of women arrived, since v.<sup>11</sup> shows that they reached the city before the women; Mary Magdalene, of course, only noticed the stone and at once turned back, without coming near enough to notice in the dim light the senseless bodies on the ground. It will be observed that the two Marys, while intending to anoint the Sacred Body later (Mk 16<sup>1</sup>), did not pay these visits for that purpose, but to reconnoitre (Mt 28<sup>1</sup>); having only seen the burial from a distance, they were uncertain as to there being any means of access to the Tomb, and hence came to 'see'—to inspect and ascertain the conditions. The angel addresses the other Mary and her companions as those who had not seen the entombment in detail when he says, 'Come, see the place where the Lord lay,' obviously implying that they had not seen it before.

The beginning of dawn had passed into 'early dawn' when the third party of women, led by Joanna, reached the Tomb, as recorded by St. Luke. Their previous acquaintance with the exact details of the burial (as we have seen already) prevented their showing any anxiety as to the removal of the stone, so they bring their spices for the embalming with them, as the Marys did not; nor did they need any invitation from the angel, but entered of their own accord, while, as they had already seen the spot where the body was laid, the angel does not point it out to them, as to the former party. It will be noticed that St. Luke gives no names of any women, until the close of his account, and then, not in connexion with the visit to the Tomb, but with the bringing of the news that it was empty to the Apostles and disciples; having mentioned the bearing of these tidings he proceeds to give three names, not of the party whose visit he had just mentioned, but of all those who brought news at different times, as we know (from St. John) that Mary Magdalene did alone, and (from St. Matthew) that the other Mary and her women did. It is significant that he should place Joanna's name *between* the other two, a probable indication that, while he knew of the other two visits, he thus arranges the names to show that each came separately, and then goes on to mention the women who accompanied the two latter. It is also a striking corroboration of St. Mark's narrative (which has yet to be considered) that St. Luke does not mention Salome, since she alone of the four principal women carried no tidings, but fled in fear (Mk 16<sup>8</sup>).

Lastly, we have St. Mark's account of the fourth party's visit, the latest of all, which took place

'when the sun was risen.' It will be noted that St. Mark gives three names of those buying spices when the Sabbath was over (Mk 16<sup>1</sup>), but passes on in the next verse to designate those whose visit he is about to describe by the pronoun 'they' (included in the verb). It is quite certain (from v.<sup>8</sup>) that he could not have included in that pronoun Mary Magdalene, of whose visit alone he knew and mentions thus, and he must also have known of the separate visit of the other Mary. The explanation of his plural pronoun, then, lies in the fact that, as the angel's address shows (vv.<sup>6,7</sup>), other women were with Salome, and also in the Greek usage by which such a pronoun (if included in the verb, and if referring to some person or thing in a previous clause) is always to be referred to the last person or thing so mentioned, as being the last in the reader's mind. Thus in Ac 6<sup>6</sup> 'they set them (the seven deacons) before the apostles' (*i.e.* the multitude, having chosen the seven, set them thus); 'and when they had prayed (not the multitude now, but the apostles, having been last mentioned) they laid their hands on them.' When therefore St. Mark writes 'they come to the Tomb,' he refers to the last persons mentioned previously, *i.e.* Salome, and those with her. This party also are uncertain as to the means of entrance, and they also are invited to see the place where the Lord's Body lay, as not having done so before. Their entire distinctness from any other party is corroborated by the fact that they alone kept silence as to their experience, and were too terrified to tell any one.

#### IV.

##### THE ORDER OF EVENTS.

If, as one ventures to think, the character of the Key to the Problem has now been adequately explained and its existence proved, it becomes possible to set down the probable order of the various events of the Resurrection Morning—probable, because, though the actual events themselves are fairly certain, there is something of conjecture as to the exact order in which one or two of them occurred.

##### 1. The Resurrection of our Lord.

The only hint we have as to when this central fact of our Redemption took place is in Mk 16<sup>9</sup>, where Christ is said to have risen 'very early' on that First Easter Day.

##### 2. The Rolling away of the Stone (Mt 28<sup>2-4</sup>).

This act of the angel was, of course, to

enable those who came to see that the Tomb was empty.

3. The Visit of Mary Magdalene (Jn 20<sup>1-3</sup>), while it was yet dark.

Expecting to meet 'the other Mary,' either in the city or at the Tomb, and missing her, she comes to the Tomb alone. Seeing the stone, she runs to report to two of the Apostles.

4. The Visit of the other Mary and women with her (Mt 28<sup>1</sup> and 5<sup>a</sup>), at the beginning of dawn.

This visit takes place while Mary Magdalene is absent on her errand to the two Apostles. From the invitation 'Come' (v.<sup>6</sup>) it would appear that the angel, who rolled away the stone, had not remained seated on it, but had entered the Tomb itself, which also explains why Mary Magdalene saw the stone but not the angel.

5. The Visit of St. John and St. Peter (Jn 20<sup>3-10</sup>).

The account of Lk 24<sup>12</sup> may be of a second visit by St. Peter, but more probably it refers to this same visit of the two Apostles, although mentioning only St. Peter (note Lk 18<sup>35</sup> compared with Mt 20<sup>30</sup>).

6. The Return of Mary Magdalene, and the First Revelation of the Risen Lord (Jn 20<sup>11-18</sup>).

She may have reached the Tomb again before they left, but more probably it was after they had gone that she returned.

7. Second Revelation of the Risen Lord (Mt 28<sup>9-10</sup>).

This took place, as recorded by St. Matthew only, to the other Mary and her party on their way back from the Tomb, and must therefore have followed immediately on that to Mary Magdalene at the Tomb itself.

8. The Visit of Joanna and women with her (Lk 24<sup>1-9</sup>), at early dawn.

This party bring spices with them, with the definite purpose of anointing the Body. They are evidently acquainted with the exact details of the burial, and enter the Tomb, without invitation. If, as is possible, they were acting by arrangement with Joseph of Arimathea, whom they accom-

panied to the burial (Lk 23<sup>53-55</sup>), they may have been expecting to find the stone removed; at any rate, it is the absence of the Body that seems to have surprised them (vv.<sup>3-4</sup>), not the removal of the stone. They see two angels, who appear in the Tomb, after the women have entered.

9. The Visit of Salome and women with her (Mk 16<sup>1-8</sup>), when the sun was risen.

This party show far more terror, at the words of the one angel whom they find in the Tomb, than any of the other visitors, and they alone disregard the command to tell the disciples, but flee from the Tomb and say nothing to any one.

The one difficulty involved in the above application of the Key to the Problem seems to lie in the fact that although at least six different visits were paid to the Tomb by five various sets of people, none of them met each other either when going or returning. Three points, however, must be borne in mind, which practically meet this difficulty. One is the dimness of the light in the hour immediately before the dawn, when at least four of the six visits took place, and when two groups of persons might easily pass each other at a little distance without recognition, while it is certain that in those perilous days any followers of Christ would endeavour to avoid recognition in public so far as was possible. The second is that, while the six visits were of very short duration, they were spread over a period of about one and a half hours, thus leaving plenty of time for intervening intervals. The third is the nearness of the Tomb to the city (Jn 19<sup>20-41</sup>). Had it been some distance away, and therefore approached by a single road, some of the parties must have encountered each other. But once within the city gate, quite near to the burial-place, probably half a dozen or more different winding streets led from or near to this exit, and with the disciples scattered in different quarters of Jerusalem, as the two different 'homes' of St. Peter and St. John indicate that they were, the fact that the going and returning parties saw nothing of each other is easily understood.



## Contributions and Comments.

### Osiris in Galilee.

Genne-Asar ;

READERS of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES who are also readers of *The Times* will have noticed the announcement made in the issue of the latter paper for February 11th, of the discovery of an Egyptian stele at the north end of the Lake of Galilee, quite close to the site of the Biblical Capernaum. The find, which was made by Mr. Bridgeman, the American Chaplain in Jerusalem, is of great importance : without going beyond the terms of the message to *The Times* (for the discoverer naturally reserves his right of exposition), we may say that this inscribed stone records a victory of the Egyptians over the Mitanni, probably in the time of Thothmes III., about 1370 B.C., and we may naturally infer that the point where the stone was found marks not only an Egyptian victory, but the position of a subsequent Egyptian colony. No evidence like the evidence of inscribed stones ! No criterion like that which is based on archæology ! That last reflection may remind readers of a recent tract of mine on St. Bees,<sup>1</sup> in which it is suggested that the nomenclature of the district round the north end of the Lake of Galilee is suspiciously redolent of the worship of Isis. The proof was, of course, defective ; all that we have to say at this point is that the hypothesis does not become less credible if we find traces of Egyptian occupation in the same area.

Suppose, now, we turn our attention in another direction ; in the text of the Synoptic Gospels, we have three references (not independent) to the Lake of Galilee and its borders under the name of Gennesaret. The consensus of Greek MSS. is fairly complete for spelling the word in this way, but when we turn to the evidence of Latin MSS. and the Syriac versions, we find almost as complete a consensus for reading the name in the form *Gennesar*. The Western form, usually treated with contempt by the textual critic, met with no little approbation, on the ground that it furnished us with a natural etymology in the explanation that *Gennê-Sar* meant *Prince's Gardens*, a meaning which could not be deduced from the longer spelling. Who, then, was the *Prince* that had practised horticulture in this favoured locality ? Most people would suggest Herod.

There is an alternative solution which presents itself to the mind ; suppose we write it :

<sup>1</sup> Woodbrooke Essays, No. 16 (Heffer).

we have, then, the *Garden of Osiris*, written legibly over the landscape ; we can put that venture along with the discovered stele and the imagined Isis to which we referred above. In the course of the inquiry we shall have vindicated the Western or Syro-Latin reading against the other forms ; we shall also have made it clear (the stone does that for us) that, since this is the fourteenth of such stelæ found in Palestine, it is about time that we began to rewrite our geography of the Holy Land, which suffers from an excess of Hebraization.

There is another direction in which we may possibly find traces of primitive Egyptian influence : the arts practised in this prosperous reign were not confined to those which they learnt from Tyre and Sidon, such as the making of glass vessels, etc. It is an open question whether the dyers and weavers of Galilee had not an Egyptian connexion. In this very district of Gennesar was a town bearing the name of Magdala, and supplying a name to one of the first and greatest of Christian saints. One quarter of Magdala was known as the dyer's quarter (*Migdal Şeböyê*), and the Talmud tells us that there were as many as eighty dye-works in that quarter, whose special occupation was the dyeing of fine linen and of woollen fabrics (for references, see Neubauer, *Geographie du Talmud*, pp. 217, 218). Suppose we ask where the dyers got their vegetable dyes from. Part of the answer, that relating to blue dye, can be obtained from Dr. Post's *Flora of Palestine*, who tells us that woad still grows in the plain of Gennesaret. The conjunction between the historical dyers on the lake-shore and the still extant dyer's weed is certainly very curious ; nor is it impossible that the first linen industry with its concomitant arts may be traceable to an initial Egyptian colonization. In Egypt, also, we can trace the woad-growers and the woad-dyers at work in the same area. The reader may take that point as certain, without my burdening the page with further references.

The Egyptologists will not need to be reminded that a sacred enclosure, or *Field of Osiris*, in which flax and cereals were grown for religious use, was attached to the temple of the deity.

We may go one step further in confirming the accuracy of our interpretation.

Suppose we ask the question whether there is any

special meaning to be attached to a Garden of Osiris that would not, let us say, be applicable to a garden of Herod. There certainly is: the papyri containing the *Books of the Dead*, which occupy so large a place in Egyptian Theology, contain vivid descriptions and actual representations of Elysian Fields, known variously as the *Fields of the Tuat* or *Fields of Peace*, which were the especial estate of Osiris; in these Fields of the Blessed, we see them 'ploughing there, reaping there, eating there, drinking there, making love there, and doing everything there that a man doth upon earth' (see *Book of the Dead*, c. 110).

Corresponding to this *Field of the Blessed*, there was a *Field of Osiris*, attached to the temples of the god, and from this Field were gathered the products that were necessary for the Ritual of the Great Mysteries.

Budge tells us in his great work on *Osiris* (ii. 25) that 'the Field of Osiris in which the sacred grain was to be sown was from 210 to 223 long (these are the measures given in the temple of Denderah); one end of it was sown with barley, the centre with dhura, and the other end with flax. . . . The barley which grew in the Field was cut on the 20th day of Tobe, and was made into sacred cakes, the dhura was also made into cakes, and the linen made from the flax was used at the festival.'

We need have no doubt, then, as to the interpretation of the name *Garden of Osiris*: it was a sacred enclosure, and there must have been a temple in the same neighbourhood.

In concluding, we observe that it need not be a transcriptional blunder, when we find the Latin of the Codex Bezae writing the name which we have been discussing in the form *Gennasar*. There is more to be learnt from the Latin side of the great MS. than has commonly been suspected.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Birmingham.

## Every Man a Burgess.

PSALM 87 has one or two memorable phrases and a picturesque list of names; but the Hebrew is laconic and cryptic, so that any translation must be also an interpretation of the text.

'His foundation is in the holy mountains. The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob.' The Psalm thus begins with a flourish of pride in the situation of Jerusalem and in the fact that it is the centre for worship, and this may be allowed to an enthusiastic citizen

who is in the mood to write a psalm. The serious thought, however, comes when the poet proceeds to dwell upon the peculiar glory of Zion. It is that her citizenship is not merely an earthly, but a religious privilege, and that it is the proud possession of men all over the world. The key to the lyric sense is the right understanding of the sentence 'this man was born there.' It is not really a statement about a man's birthplace, suggesting a spiritual allusion to conversion, but a statement of his legal status, his citizenship in law, his burgess right in the Holy City and in the privileges of its religion. The point is not, as is often taken, that among the nations, and especially at Jerusalem, conversions have occurred, but that in all these places, and above all in Zion, men are living whose real citizenship is in the kingdom of God. A rather free translation of the fourth verse into modern words would run:

'From Egypt to Iraq, from the Syrian coasts to the Nile,  
God names those that know Him, saying, Each of them is a burgess of Zion.'

And in the sixth verse the thought is repeated:

'From among all the nations, when the tale is written,  
The Lord shall take count of the burgesses of Zion.'

The Psalm is thus a missionary psalm; it glories in the result of Judah's mission, that man after man in strange surroundings had his real franchise, not in Tyre, or Babylon, or elsewhere, but in Jerusalem.

More emphatically, however, it is a psalm of the Home Base. For the hinge on which the thought turns is the contrast in the fifth verse, where the poet withdraws his eyes from distant and heathen lands, where only one at a time God's folk are to be found, and, looking at Jerusalem, exclaims:

'But in Zion every man is a burgess,  
And the Most High preserveth the city.'

The glorious thing is that, in Zion, not one man here and another there, but man after man, every one claims and enjoys his native right in God's kingdom. The glory of the far-flung mission is surpassed by the glory of its living centre, where 'every man is a burgess.' For the ideal city, the ideal church, the ideal Home Base, this should be the watchword.

R. W. STEWART.

Aberdeen.



## Entre Nous.

### Letters to a Friend.

A small volume of letters of Rabindranath Tagore to C. F. Andrews has just been published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin—the title is *Rabindranath Tagore: Letters to a Friend* (7s. 6d. net). Most of the letters were written in 1920–21, when the poet was travelling in the United States, getting into touch with men of peace and goodwill in the West, and opening to them the hospitality of his religious retreat at Santiniketan.

‘Why have I been made to carry this burden, I ask myself over and over again, shouting myself hoarse in this noisy world where everybody is crying up his own wares? Pushing the wheelbarrows of propaganda from continent to continent—is this going to be the climax of a poet’s life? It seems to me like an evil dream, from which I occasionally wake up in the dead of night and grope about in the bed, asking myself in consternation: “Where is my music?”’

‘It is lost, but I had no right to lose it, for I did not earn it with the sweat of my brow; it was a gift to me, which I could deserve if I knew how to love it. You know I have said somewhere that “God praises me when I do good; but God loves me when I sing.” Praise is reward; it can be measured against the work you render; but love is above all rewards; it is measureless.’

There are few intimate touches, but now and again we have a glimpse into what Andrews is to him. ‘When all my thoughts were furiously revolving, like dead leaves, in a whirlwind of desire for raising funds, a picture came to my hand; it was that of Sujata offering a cup of milk to Buddha. Its message went deep into my heart. It said to me: “The cup of milk comes to you unasked when you have gone through your *tapasya*. It is offered to you with love, and only love can bring its homage to truth.”’

‘Then your figure at once came to my mind. The milk has been sent to me through you. It is infinitely more than anything that can come from the cheque-book of the rich. I had become famished in the wilderness of solitude for lack of sympathy and comradeship, when you brought your cup of love to me, which is the true life-giving food freely offered by life. And as the poet Morris says, “Love is enough.” That voice of love calls me away from the lure of dollars—the voice that comes to nestle in my heart from across the sea,

from the shady avenue of *sal* trees resonant with laughter and songs of simple joy.’

We have no hesitation in saying that we owe Mr. Andrews a debt of gratitude for his decision to publish the letters. That they were written for one person only in the first place, and that an intimate friend, is only an advantage; for it has enabled Tagore to express freely his inmost thoughts on questions near his heart—internationalism, peace and war, self-realization, formal Christianity, the dangers which beset the preacher, pain and sorrow, and many others. Of pain he says: ‘This world is wonderfully beautiful, but you cannot help feeling that there is a lurking pain in its heart which has its own immortal beauty. It is a pearl shell of wonderful tints and design, hiding in its bosom a tear-drop which gives it priceless value. All our payments have to be made in pain; otherwise life and this world would become cheap as dirt.’

But to give the full impression of the beauty of thought and language we must give one letter in greater fulness.

### The Turn of the Divine.

‘NEW YORK, December 19th, 1920.

‘When Life began her first experiments, she was mightily proud of the hugeness of her animal specimens. The bigger the bodies were, the more extravagantly large the armour had to be made for their protection. The ludicrous creatures, in order to maintain their balance, had to carry a tail which was absurdly disproportionate to the rest of their bodies. It went on like this till life became a burden to itself and to the exchequer of creation. It was uneconomical, and therefore not only harmful but ungainly. True economy is the principle of beauty in practical arithmetic. Driven to bewilderment, Life began to seek for a pause in her insanity of endless multiplication.

All forms of ambitious powers are obsessed by this delirium of multiplication. All its steps are steps towards augmentation and not completeness. But ambitions that rely solely upon the suggestion of their tails and armour are condemned to carry their own obstruction till they have to stop.

In its early history, Life, after its orgies of megalomania, had at last to think of disarmament. But how did she effect it? By boldly relinquishing the ambition to produce bigness—and man was



born helplessly naked and small. All of a sudden he was disinherited of the enormity of flesh when apparently he was most in need of it. But this prodigious loss gained for him his freedom and victory.

'Then began the reign of Mind. It brought its predecessor of gigantic bulk under subjection. But, as often happens, the master became the parasite of the slave, and Mind also tried to achieve greatness by the bigness of materials. The dynasty of Mind followed the dynasty of Flesh, but employed this flesh as its prime minister.

Our history is waiting for the dynasty of Spirit. The human succeeded the brutal; and now comes the turn of the Divine.'<sup>1</sup>

#### The Warrior, the Woman, and the Christ.

At a soldiers' meeting held behind the lines, a perky little private asked Mr. Studdert Kennedy whether he was going back to take mothers' meetings *après la guerre*. A roar of laughter greeted Mr. Kennedy's reply. 'Look here, young fellow my lad, you seem to think that you are more important than your mother. You come off it. I'd rather talk to your mother than to you any day of the week, Sundays included.' What made this private associate the padre with mothers' meetings? The answer is obvious, Mr. Kennedy thinks. It is because the warrior—the really manly man—despises them both. Why does he despise them both? This was the question which set Mr. Kennedy's mind working, and which has led him to write *The Warrior, the Woman, and the Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It does not pretend to be a book for the expert. It is written for the ordinary man who is up against the problems of life and who has got to the stage of asking himself, Is there any meaning in life, and, if so, what is it? He will find that he can read Mr. Studdert Kennedy's book not only with profit, but with pleasure. For it is always easier to follow thought in the making than to grasp cut-and-dry conclusions. And so we companion along the way with Mr. Kennedy as question after question rises up to tease his mind. Why is it that in all the churches women outnumber men, so that it appears to us quite natural to hear 'a very good congregation, and quite a nice number of men'? Is Christianity as it is preached to-day not a man's religion? Is the minister called upon to preach a more 'manly' Christ? What attitude can we take up to the fact of sex? Must it be atheistic or agnostic? Or can we take up the positively theistic attitude that sex has behind

it some great spiritual purpose? In short, has Christianity some positive message for both men and women, some ideal of life where the creative craving of the woman will not be lost but fulfilled and where the warrior will not lose or bottle up his fighting spirit? And so Mr. Studdert Kennedy comes to Jesus the creative warrior who reveals the creative warrior God. 'We are now, I think, in a position to return an intelligible if inadequate answer to the great question: What kind of human life did Jesus live on earth? He lived the life of the transforming man determined, for the sake of the joy that was set before Him, to transform the world of men and things into the Kingdom of God, and by means of a creative conflict waged without thought of wounds or death to make the world of appearance manifest the eternal values of reality. He was the warrior man with all the warrior qualities—fire, energy, intellect, aggressiveness, and attack—undiminished and unimpaired, but entirely consecrated to the creative purpose of the woman, the building of the kingdom of life and growth which is the Kingdom of God.'

'Whosoever shall smite thee.'

'From the practical point of view He was a teacher of absurdities. "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." What sort of mess would we be in if we really tried to practise that? I remember once in the North of England endeavouring to explain and interpret that saying to a large crowd in the open air, when an odd specimen of humanity with a heavily pock-marked face and red rims to his eyes looked up underneath another man's elbow and said: "That's all right and tha can do as tha likes, but I'm not going to be made a — doormat of for nobody." It is the idea that Christ bids us do nothing in the face of evil, but simply lie down to be trodden on, that makes His teaching seem absurd. But the man who, being smitten on the one cheek, deliberately turned the other, would not be doing nothing, he would be doing what, for a free and full-blooded man, is the most difficult thing in the world to do. He would have to be a very remarkable person, a man devoid of fear, and a man devoid of fear is possessed of power—moral power. Even beasts are uncomfortable and cowed in the presence of the man who has cast out fear.

'What Christ is bidding us do is to substitute moral force for physical force in our conflict with evil, and there is much more in that than appears on the surface. What moral force is, it is difficult to say in words, but even now it is an immense

<sup>1</sup> *Rabindranath Tagore: Letters to a Friend*, 107.



and incalculable power in the world, and who can say to what lengths it can and will be extended?'<sup>1</sup>

### Virtues in our Character.

When the Rev. William Gray, M.A., retired from Cambuslang, he was persuaded to re-write the addresses which he had given to the children. He calls this collection of children's sermons *Happy as Kings* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), and of it the late Dr. G. H. Morrison says in a Foreword, 'I shall be greatly surprised if this book does not take high rank in the ever-growing library of addresses to the younger folk.' One that attracts us is on 'The Mavis—A Famous Builder.' Mr. Gray watched the mavis building her nest. Then in autumn, after she was done with it, he took it out of the bush and into his study, and he found out that the nest was made up of 3727 little things, every one of which the mavis had carried. 'Please stand at attention and salute the great builder as you would Solomon.' And surely Mr. Gray deserves salutations also, for it must have taken him hours of work to count up these 3727 items. He found 927 withered grasses—old things got from past summers. 'So in our character should appear the fine old virtues that appeared in the heroes and heroines of the past.' And, secondly, he found in the nest 582 bits of moss, and moss belongs to the lowly plants. 'So in our character should appear the lowly virtues, humility and meekness.' Third, he found in the nest, 1673 hairs, some of them were very long; they were woven amongst the moss and leaves and grasses in order to bind them together. 'So in our character there should be the *binding virtues*: faith, trust, confidence.' Fourth, he found 257 bits of carpet and hearthrug. 'I know where she got them. Spring cleaning was on. . . . So in our character there should appear the *homely virtues*: courtesy, mannerliness, usefulness, obedience; the very common qualities that everybody must possess.' 'Fifth, I found in the build of the nest *twelve feathers*, and feathers remind us of *wings*, with which to rise. So we must have the *hopeful virtues* in our character.' The sixth thing which he found in the nest was a number of soft, downy, cosy things. 'So we must have in our character the *gentle virtues*. We must be kind, pitiful, gentle, compassionate.' And lastly, he found a number of coloured things—red worsted, a bit of blue cloth, one or two gay feathers. 'So in our character we should have the *lightsome, happy virtues*. We should learn to laugh heartily, to be merry and

bright, to love music and singing, to love sports and games.'

### NEW POETRY.

Edna A. Kahla.

The imprint of the Poetry Lovers' Fellowship is upon a small volume containing *The Poems of Edna A. Kahla* (5s. net), and we are told that this imprint upon a volume indicates 'that the contents are of the highest poetic value and their publication beyond any possibility of criticism.' Human nature being what it is, such a statement is inclined to arouse all our prejudices, but the poems themselves disarm us, for there is no doubt that the authentic note is here in Miss Kahla's work:

### THANKSGIVING.

Thou Who hast laden me  
With countless eager, touching tendernesses,  
Be gentle in Thy generosity!  
How shall I bear the burden of this love  
Who am but frailty?

And how shall I requite that mighty Heart  
That lonely, puissant, patient, and apart,  
Awaits how wistfully  
In love's reply one fond, one fugitive thought,  
One murmured word?

O Thou Who waitest sad and patiently,  
I cannot slake the love-thirst of Thy Heart;  
Knowest Thou not my utter poverty?  
Even my gratitude I ask of Thee.

### DAY'S END.

I cannot bring thee broken offerings;  
Bearing such gifts what could I say to thee?  
'Accept my treachery'?

Wilt thou receive these broken offerings,  
Fallen from faltering hands  
Because the road was rough and wearying?  
In trembling hands,  
Eager, but frail, I could not hold them fast.  
They fell at last.—  
The road was long and rough and wearying.  
Shall ways be gentle if the feet be wild?  
Give Me the fragments, child.

<sup>1</sup> G. A. Studdert Kennedy, *The Warrior, the Woman, and the Christ*, 86.